STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
main,stks 205Ev13
Lutheran quarterly.
v.16 1886 Lutheran quarterly
0 0001 00658518 4

REFERENCE

PENNSYLVANIA STATE LIBRARY
1745

COLLECTIONS

04-79-782-5

THE

# LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

EDITED BY

E. J. WOLF, D. D., AND P. M. BIKLÉ, PH. D.

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

M. VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D.

NEW SERIES—VOL. XVI.

GETTYSBURG:
J. E. WIBLE, STEAM PRINTER, CARLISLE STREET (SECOND SQUARE).
1886.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/vol16lutheranqua00luth

# INDEX TO VOL. XVI.


American Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance, 549.
Anstadt, Rev. A., Arts. by, 1, 405.
Antiquities, Egyptian, and the Bible, 345.
Baptism, Infant, 514.
Bergstresser, Dr. P., Art. by, 253.
Bible History, Light on from Egyptian Antiquities, 345.
Book Notices, 137, 301, 436, 615.
Bourdaloue, 564.
Bushnell, Rev. J. E., Art. by, 295.
Christian Idea, The, and Justification by Faith, 191.
Christianity, Historical, 56.
Christianity in India, 412.
Christian Preaching: Its Material and Its End, 123.
Church Elections, Law of, 273.
Communion of Saints, 593.
Communion Wine, 1.
Demarest, Rev. J. K., Art. by, 368.
Divine Image Lost and Restored, 253.
Earnest, Rev. J. A., Art. by, 108.
Effort to Reconstruct History in the Interest of the General Council, 571.
Egyptian Antiquities, Light on the Bible from, 345.
Elections, Church, Law of, 273.
End of Christian Preaching, 123.
Evolution of Religion, 42.
Faith, Justification by, and the Christian Idea, 191.
Fischer, Rev. W. E., Art. by, 423.
Fox, Dr. L. A., Art. by, 157.
Furst, Rev. S. E., Art. by, 390.
General Council, Effort to Reconstruct History in the Interest of, 571.
God is Love, 390.
Guss, Prof. A. L., Art. by, 222.
Have We the Original Text of the Holy Scriptures, 529.
Hall, Rev. H. H., Art. by, 564.
Heilman, Rev. L. M., Art. by, 514.
Hill, Dr. David J., Art. by, 42.
Himes, Prof. J. A., Art. by, 179.
Historical Christianity, 56.
Holman Lecture, 459.
Hull, Rev. Wm., Art. by, 273.
Hull, Rev. W. E., Art. by, 549.
Human Nature, Ministerial Acquaintance with, 368.
Image, The Divine, Lost and Restored, 253.
India, Christianity in, 412.
Infant Baptism the Basis of Christian Nurture, 514.
Introduction of Human Life into the World, 84.
Invocation of the Saints, 459.
Jewish-Christian Movement in Southern Russia, 378.
Judas, Presence of at the Supper, 405.
Justification by Faith and the Christian Idea, 191.
Koller, Dr. J. C., Art. by, 459.
Law of Church Elections, 273.
Liberty, Religious, and Luther, 222.
Life, Human, Introduction of, into the World, 84.


81719

Light on Bible History from Egyptian Antiquities, 345.
Literary Intelligence, 134, 433.
Love, God is, 390.
Luther and Religious Liberty, 222.
Luther as Poet in Daily Life, 423.
Lutheran Church, Preparatory Service in, 108.
Lutheran Church History, Some Items of, 295.
Man or Machine? 96.
Material of Christian Preaching, 123.
Ministerial Acquaintance with Human Nature, 368.
Ministerial Support, 233.
Miracles of the New Testament, 157.
Missionary Alliance, Inter-Seminary, 549.
New Publications, Notices of, 134, 301, 436, 615.
New Testament, Miracles of, 157.
Nichols, Rev. J., Art. by, 412.
Notices of New Publications, 134, 301, 436, 615.
Nurture, Christian, and Infant Baptism, 514.
Original Text of the Holy Scriptures, 529.
Pick, Dr. B., Art. by, 529.
Poet, Luther as, in Daily Life, 423.
Preaching, Christian: Its Material and Its End, 123.
Preparatory Service in the Lutheran Church, 108.
Presence of Judas at the Supper, 405.
Progress of Christianity in India, 412.
Reconstructing History for the General Council, 571.
Relation of Science to Religion, 327.
Religion, Evolution of, 42.
Religion and Science, 327.
Religious Liberty and Luther, 222.
Richard, Dr. J. W., Arts. by, 123, 593.
Russia, Southern, Jewish-Christian Movement in, 378.
Saints, Communion of, 593.
Saints, Invocation of the, 459.
Schodde, Dr. G. H., Art. by, 378.
Science and Religion, 327.
Scriptures, Have We the Original Text of the? 529.
Seyffarth, Dr. G., Art. by, 345.
Shakspeare, Why We Study, 179.
Some Items of Lutheran Church History, 295.
Sprecher, Dr. S., Art. by, 191.
Stuckenberg, Dr. J. H. W., Art. by, 323.
Supper, Presence of Judas at the, 405.
Support, Ministerial, 233.
Valentine, Dr. M., Art. by, 571.
Weigle, Rev. E. D., Art. by, 233.
Wells, Dr. S. C., Art. by, 84.
Why We Study Shakspeare, 179.
Wine, Communion, 1.
World, Introduction of Human Life into, 84.
Wynn, Dr. W. H., Art. by, 56.

THE

# QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

# THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JANUARY, 1886.

## ARTICLE I.

### COMMUNION WINE.*

By REV. P. ANSTADT, A. M., Editor *Teachers' Journal*, York, Pa.

What kind of wine shall we place on our communion tables? The time has come when the Church must answer this question. Shall we use the unfermented fruit of the vine? or shall we use the fermented, alcoholic, intoxicating wines of commerce? The prevailing practice in the churches has been to use the latter kind, and a formidable array of learning has been brought forward to prove that only the fermented juice of the grape can properly be called wine, that the unfermented grape-juice is not wine at all, that Christ made and drank fermented wine and used it at the institution of the Holy Supper, and consequently none but the fermented juice of the grape should be used at the celebration of that holy ordinance. I propose to show in this article, that the unfermented juice of the grape is also called wine in

*The following works have been consulted, and we have availed ourselves more or less of their help in the preparation of this article. We give the titles for the benefit of those who desire to enter more deeply into the study of this subject: The Temperance Bible Commentary, by Dr. F. R. Lees; Temperance Text Book, by the same author; Oinos: A Discussion of the Bible Wine Question, by Leon C. Field, A. M.; The Bible Rule of Temperance, by Geo. Duffield, D. D.; Unfermented Wine a Fact, by Norman Herr, M. D., F. L. S.; The Wines of the Bible, by C. D. Fowler, D. D.; Communion Wine and Bible Temperance, by Rev. W. M. Thayer; Gospel Temperance, by Rev. J. M. Van Buren; Wine Drinking and the Scriptures, by Prof. Taylor Lewis, LL. D.; Moderation and Total Abstinence, or Dr. Crosby and his Reviewers.

the Scriptures, that this was undoubtedly the kind which Christ made, drank and used at the institution of the Lord's Supper, and consequently the most appropriate kind for Christians to use for this purpose now. My first proposition is that

I. *There are two kinds of wine spoken of in the Bible.* The one kind is commended as a blessing, the other is denounced as a curse. The word wine is a generic term, in which a number of species are embraced, which are all called wine, whether fermented or unfermented, and it is only by their context that we are enabled to tell which kind is meant. All that is necessary to convince any intelligent mind of this truth, is to compare some of the passages of Scripture with each other in which the word wine occurs. He must be dull of comprehension, indeed, who cannot see from the language in which wine is spoken of in different passages, that there is more than one kind of wine alluded to in the Bible. For convenience in the comparison I will place a few of these opposite Scripture wine passages side by side in parallel columns:

| | |
|---|---|
| Wine which cheereth God and man. Judges 9 : 13. | Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging. Prov. 20 : 1. |
| Corn shall make the young men cheerful and new wine the maids. Zech. 9 : 17. | Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink, that continue until night till wine inflame them. Isaiah 5 : 11. |
| | Weep and howl, O ye drinkers of wine. Joel 1 : 5. |
| Wine that maketh glad the heart of man. Psalm 104 : 15. | Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth its color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright (when it foams). At last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder. Prov. 23 : 31, 32. |
| So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine. Prov. 3 : 10. | Their wine is the poison of dragons, and the cruel venom of asps. Deut. 32 : 33. |
| They shall dwell under his shadow; they shall be revived as the corn, and grow as the vine, the scents thereof shall be as the wine of Lebanon. Hosea 14 : 7. | In the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the wine is red, it is full of mixture, and he poureth out of the same; but the dregs thereof all the wicked of the earth shall wring them out and drink them. Psalm 75 : 8. |

Come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. Isa. 55 : 1.

Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that puttest thy bottle to him, and maketh him drunk. Hab. 2 : 15.

Now the Bible is certainly consistent with itself; no one passage can really contradict another; yet how can these opposite designations of wine be reconciled on the one-wine theory, which contends that only one kind of wine is spoken of in the Bible, namely the fermented, alcoholic and intoxicating, and whose advocates sneer at what they call the "exploded two-wine theory?"

In the above passages, let it be observed, that it is not the *quantity* of the wine drank, but the *quality* that is condemned.

I append also the following tabular statement, kindly compiled for my use in this article from Abbott's Commentary, by Rev. L. A. Gotwald, D. D.

THE BIBLE

| COMMENDS WINE. | CONDEMNS WINE. |
|---|---|
| As an offering to God with oil and wheat: Numbers 18 : 12. Nehemiah 10 : 37–39. | As a cause of violence and woe: Prov. 4 : 17; 23 : 29–32. |
| As a blessing to man: Gen. 27 : 28–37. Deut. 7 : 13. Judges 9 : 13. Proverbs 3 : 10. Isaiah 65 : 8. Joel 3 : 18. Ps. 104 : 15. Zech. 9 : 17. | Of self security and irreligion: Isaiah 28 : 7; 56 : 12. Hab. 2 : 5. |
| As an emblem of spiritual blessing: Isaiah 55 : 1. Sol. Songs 7 : 9. | As a poison: Deut. 32 : 33. Prov. 23 : 31. Hosea 7 : 5. |
| As a perpetual memorial of Christ's atoning sacrifice: Matt. 26 : 26–29. Mark 14 : 22–25. 1st Cor. 10 : 16. | As an accompaniment of wickedness: Isaiah 5 : 22. |
| As a medicine: Prov. 31 : 6, 7. 1 Tim. 5 : 23. | As an emblem of divine wrath: Ps. 60 : 3; 75 : 8. Isaiah 51 : 17. Jer. 25 : 15. Rev. 14 : 10; 16 : 10. |
| By the example of Jesus Christ: John 2 : 1–11. Luke 7 : 34. | By the example of priests on entering the tabernacle: Lev. 10 : 8–11. |
| | Of Rechabites: Jer. 35 : 6. |
| | Of Nazarites: Numb. 6 : 2, 3. |
| | Of Daniel: Daniel 1 : 8, 12. |

How can we avoid the inference that two different kinds of

wine are designated by these totally different characterizations of them? Prof. Moses Stuart, one of the greatest biblical scholars of our age, says, "I cannot refuse to take this position, without virtually impeaching the Scriptures of contradiction or inconsistency."

An attempt has been made to meet this argument by citing other things, which it is claimed, are spoken of in the Scriptures in like contradictory terms. Prof. Bumstead in *Bibliotheca Sacra.* Jan. '81, instances rain, as a blessing, "given alike to the just and the unjust, and as a curse, sent to destroy the inhabitants of the earth in the flood." Dr. Moore, in the *Princeton Review*, cites the tongue, which St. James calls a fire, a world of iniquity, but which is nevertheless "an organ of unspeakable benefit to man;" wrath, "which may be either a blessing or a curse," knowledge, which St. Paul says "puffeth up, but which is elsewhere described in the Scriptures as an excellent thing," marriage which the apostle both approves (1 Tim. 4 : 3) and disapproves (1 Cor. 7 : 1), God, who is "love" and "a consuming fire," Christ, who is both a Saviour and a "stone of stumbling;" the lion who is an emblem of Christ and of the devil; leaven, unto which the kingdom of heaven is likened, and of which, as the symbol of Pharisaic doctrine, men are bidden to beware, and the four cups of the Passover, which the Talmud expressly declares, symbolize both blessings and curses. And then both authors ask, if we are to infer in these cases, that there are two kinds of rain, tongues, knowledge, &c., or that the distinction lies in the uses of the several objects? As regards the rain, the lion, the leaven, the Passover cups, it is apparent on the surface that they are used in a purely figurative sense, and that in no instance is the object itself intended to be described as intrinsically good or bad. It is not the tongue of flesh that is meant, for example, but the evil disposition which it symbolizes, and which would remain, were the physical member literally cut out. As regards the other examples, it is admitted that the best gifts may be abused, and that even so excellent a thing as knowledge may become an "accession of pride." But the warning against the abuse of a good thing furnishes no parallel against the use of a kind of wine which is distinctly declared a

bad thing, as in Prov. 20 : 1, "Wine is a mocker," and in many other passages. This remark applies also to marriage, which is everywhere commended in the Scriptures, except in this special instance, where under exceptional circumstances it is suggested as inexpedient. As regards wealth, the Bible nowhere condemns it, or warns against it as intrinsically bad, but it warns against the inordinate desire for it. Dr. Moore, in *Presb. Review*, says, "Some people, to be consistent, should put away wealth, as an accursed thing," and refers to 1 Tim. 6 : 9, 10. But the apostle does not say that money, but the *love* of money is a root of evil. The reference to God and Christ and their two-fold attitude towards sin and the persistent sinner on the one hand, and toward the repentant believer on the other are in no sense pertinent to the case in hand.

We hold, therefore, that there are two kinds of wine spoken of in the Bible; the two classes of passages in the Scriptures, the one condemnatory and the other commendatory, could not be indiscriminately applied to the two substances. Unfermented wine would not be forbidden, since it is a perfectly natural, nutritious and healthful beverage. It could not properly be the symbol of wrath and destruction any more than the corn and oil with which it is often joined. It would be the proper emblem of mercy and salvation, as bread and oil are (for example, Psalm 104 : 15), and as it is itself especially in the Lord's Supper. On the other hand, fermented wine could not properly be commended for use, or employed as a symbol of blessing and life, as alcohol is detrimental to the health of the system. The Scriptures describe it as poison. Such is the signification of the Hebrew term *Chemah*. This is the word which the Psalmist uses, when he says, (Psalm 140 : 3), Adder's poison, (*Chemah*), is under their lips. This explains the figure in Prov. 23 : 32, "At last it stingeth like an adder." So we read, "Their wine (*Chemah*), is the poison of dragons," Deut. 32 : 33. "Take the wine cup of his fury," literally, take the cup of the wine which is poison (*Chemah*), Jer. 25 : 15. "The princes have made him sick with bottles (literally, *Chemah*, poison) of wine." "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that puttest thy bottle (literally *chemah*, poison) to him." Hab. 2 : 15. It is incredi-

ble, that such a substance, which the Bible and science unite in describing as a poison, a fermented, alcoholic wine, should be the same as that which the sacred Scriptures commend and sanction, and the Saviour hallowed in the Holy Supper.

The two kinds of wine are totally distinct in their constituent parts, as shown in the following comparative table:

| UNFERMENTED WINE IS COMPOSED OF | FERMENTED WINE IS COMPOSED OF |
|---|---|
| 1. Gluten. | 1. *Alcohol:* |
| 2. Sugar. | 2. *Œnanthic Acid.* |
| 3. Gum. | 3. *Œnanthic Ether.* |
| 4. Various odorous matters. | 4. *Essential, or volatile oils.* |
| 5. Malic Acid. | 5. *Acetic Acid.* |
| 6. Citric Acid. | 6. *Sulphate of Potash.* |
| 7. Phosphorus, and | 7. Bouquet, or Aroma. |
| 8. Sulphur in combination. | 8. Chlorides of Potassium and Sodium. |
| 9. Bitartrate of Potash. | 9. Tannin and coloring matter. |
| 10. Tartrate of Lime. | 10. Undecomposed Sugar, Gum, etc., in small quantities. |
| 11. Water, &c. | |

The first six elements in the second table are entirely new compounds, and there is no more chemical identity between the two substances, than between barley and beer.

The following table taken from Encyclopedia Britannica given by Brande in 1881–3, shows the percentage of alcohol in the different kinds of fermented wines:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lissa | 25.41 | Rhine Wine, max. | 13.31 |
| Port, maximum | 23.92 | Rhine Wine, min. | 8.00 |
| Port, minimum | 19.82 | Tokay | 10.46 |
| Madeira, average | 20.25 | Wico | 13.50 |
| Constantia | 18.29 | Shiraz | 14.40 |
| Lachrymae Christi | 18.24 | Frontignan | 11.80 |
| Cherry, max. | 18.37 | Malmsey | 15.20 |
| Cherry, min. | 17.00 | Bucellas | 17.10 |
| Lisbon | 17.45 | Hermittage, white | 16.14 |
| Malaga | 15.98 | Roussillion | 15.96 |
| Bordeaux, (claret) max. | 15.11 | Tinto (Red French) | 12.32 |
| Bordeaux, min. | 11.95 | Burgundy, max. | 12.32 |
| Graves (Bordeaux) | 11.84 | Burgundy, min. | 11.00 |
| Champaigne, white | 11.84 | Nice | 13.50 |
| Champaigne, red | 10.64 | | |

In *Tirosh*, "vintage produce," the unfermented wine, there is

not a deleterious element. Gluten makes blood, and sugar is "fattening." But after fermentation the elements, as the analysis shows, are changed. Both gluten and sugar are destroyed, and alcohol and other constituents take their place. The alcohol results from the sugar, and is highly intoxicating and poisonous. How appropriate for the Bible to say, as it does: "Its wine (tirosh) is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not, for a *blessing* is in it!" It is eqnally appropriate for the Bible to say of the other: "Wine (yayin) is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and whoso is deceived thereby is not wise." Would it be appropriate to say of unfermented wine (tirosh): "Wine is a mocker," &c.? Of course it would not.

My second proposition is that

II. *The Scriptures distinguish between these two kinds of wine by the words which they employ to designate them.* There are eleven Hebrew words used in the Old Testament, which are all translated *wine* in our authorized English version; namely:

*Yayin.* This is the first and most frequently used word for wine in the Old Testament. It is a generic term including the unfermented, or pure "blood of the grape," preserved juice, and the juice after being fermented, and drugged, as well. It occurs in all 141 times. It is employed by Nehemiah 5 : 18 in the phrase *kal-yayin*, LXX, *en passin oinos*, Vulg., *vina diversa*. English version, "all sorts of wine." In many of the texts where *yayin* occurs it is applied to the unfermented juice of the grape, as Canticles 5 : 1 (compared with 7 : 9), where *yayin* refers to a sweet, innocent wine, which might be drunk "abundantly" by young women. But in other passages it is applied to every species of fermented grape juice, as in Prov. 23 : 31, where it is described as 'red' and 'sparkling,' and 'moving itself,' in which condition we are forbidden even to look upon it with desire.

*Ahsis* occurs in five texts. Cant. 8 : 2; Isa. 49 : 26; Joel 1 : 5; 3 : 18; Amos 9 : 13. The word is plainly connected with *ahsas*, 'to tread,' and denotes 'something trodden out.' It is grape juice purely; and denotes the newly expressed juice of the grape, or other fruit.

*Sobe*, from *sabah*, to drink to satiation, occurs but three times.

It probably denoted a rich boiled wine, such as would speedily surfeit. In Isa. 1 : 22 the allusion to mixing with water favors the vein of a boiled wine. Hosea 4 : 18 "Their drink is sour," literally "sour is their *sobe*," which suggests Columella's remark, "Defructum is accustomed to grow sour, however carefully prepared." There is no proof that *sobe* ever designated an intoxicating beverage.

*Tirosh.* This word occurs thirty-eight times in the Hebrew Bible, first in Gen. 27 : 28, "Plenty of corn and wine." It is translated "wine" in our English Bible twenty-six times, "new wine" eleven times, and "sweet wine" once. More controversy has been waged over this term than over all the other words for wine combined. A careful examination of this term in all the passages where it is used has induced Dr. Lees to conclude that it means "not wine at all, but the fruit of the vineyard in its natural condition." *Tirosh* seems to have been the word used for vine-fruit in its natural, solid state, and with special reference to its being the source and material of wine. In thirty instances it is mentioned in connection with *dagan*, "corn;" in twenty-one instances it occurs in connection with *yitzhar*, "oil." Dr. Lees says, "These three terms constitute a beautiful triad of blessings, 1. *corn*-fruit, 2. *vine*-fruit, 3. *orchard*-fruit, or, in other words the produce of the field, vineyard and orchard. In Micah 6 : 15 we have a beautiful Hebrew parallelism which illustrates this position :

> Thou shalt sow, but shalt not reap;
> Thou shalt tread the olives (*zayith*), but shalt not anoint thee with oil;
> And (tread) *tirosh*, but shalt not drink *yayin*.

This makes it plain that *tirosh* was the natural source of *yayin*, as the olive was of the oil. It is everywhere treated as a natural product. It is found "in the cluster," (Isa. 65 : 8), "gathered," (Deut. 11 : 14), put into "storehouse," (2 Chron. 32 : 28), "trodden," (Micah 6 : 15), "burst out from the press," (Prov. 3 : 10), and makes the vats "overflow," (Joel 2 : 24). It is never spoken of as being poured out, put into cups, or drunk, except in a single instance, Isa. 62 : 8, and here, no doubt, it is spoken of figuratively or elliptically. But in not one of those 38 passages where the term *tirosh* occurs and is translated wine in the

English Bible, can it be shown that it means fermented or intoxicating wine. This is virtually admitted by all the advocates of the so-called "one wine" theory. Thus Smith's dictionary of the Bible says, "The allusions to the effects of *tirosh* are confined to a single passage, but this is a most decisive one, namely Hos. 4 : 11, 'Whoredom and wine (*yayin*), and new wine (*tirosh*) take away the heart,' where *tirosh* appears as the climax of engrossing influence, in immediate connection with *yayin*." These words were copied in Schaff's edition of Herzog's Encyclopedia and are quoted by all that have written on that side of the question, so far as we have seen, and they seem to regard it as an unanswerable argument, that *tirosh* is the Hebrew term along with *yayin*, for intoxicating wine. But when they admit, that of the 38 times in which *tirosh* appears in the Hebrew Bible, it cannot be shown to mean intoxicating wine, but maintain that only in this one place it means intoxicating wine, then they admit that this is an exception to the general rule. But certainly 37 instances on the one side must outweigh the one exception on the other side. Now, they are as much bound to explain the exception as we are, but we have not seen that they have ever attempted such an explanation. We will, therefore, volunteer an explanation for them.

In a climax the last term must be the strongest or highest in degree. In this instance, if it is a climax, *tirosh*, new wine, must be more intoxicating than *yayin*, old wine, but *tirosh* in the other 37 passages where it occurs can not be shown to be intoxicating at all, but *yayin* is in many passages clearly an intoxicating wine, therefore this passage contains no climax at all as regards the degree of the power of intoxication. A careful study of the context will give us the best explanation of this passage. The people of Israel had apostatized from God and committed idolatry, which in the Scriptures is called whoredom, and it is also actually attended by licentiousness and sensuality in the use of intoxicating drinks. But *tirosh*, as has been shown, does not mean wine at all, but vine-fruit, grapes in clusters, and therefore by a figure of speech vineyards, possessions, riches, all which took away their hearts from God. We quote here the language of Dr. Lees in his admirable Bible Commentary:

1. "By 'whoredom' is here to be understood, as throughout the prophecy, illicit worship rendered by the chosen people to heathen gods. This worship was spiritual fornication, and by it their hearts were captivated—literally 'taken away' from that exclusive trust and allegiance which they owed to God, as Jehovah of hosts and their covenant King.

2. "By *yayin*, wine,—the type of sensual gratification—their hearts had also been captivated—drawn away from that supreme affection which they owed to God as their divine Redeemer and Benefactor.

3. By *tirosh*, the fruit of the vine—the type of natural, earthly good,—their hearts had been captivated—'taken away' from God, as the infinite goodness and the fountain of spiritual joy."

This was the threefold apostacy of which the children of Israel had been guilty. (1). They went after strange gods, instead of after the true God; (2). Their best affections consisted in sensual pleasure, instead of being fixed upon the Divine love; (3). And their estimate of good was limited to earthly things, (represented by *tirosh*, one of the most delicious of natural elements) instead of embracing Him 'from whom all blessings flow.'

This disposes of the last resort of those who hold that both *yayin* and *tirosh* are intoxicating articles.

*Shechar.* This word occurs twenty-three times. It is rendered "strong drink" in all instances, except Num. 28 : 7, where it is translated "strong wine," and in Ps. 69 : 7, where, instead of drinkers of *shechar* the A. V. reads simply "drunkards." As *yayin* is the generic term for the liquid of *tirosh*, so *shechar* is the generic term for *yitschar*, orchard fruit, or of any other fruit than the grape, such as dates, pomegranates, &c. It probably originally denoted sweet juices of all kinds, but came at length, in distinction from *yayin*, to be applied to the juices of other fruits than grapes, and, like *yayin*, was used generically of both fermented and unfermented drinks.

*Chemer* occurs several times in the Hebrew Bible. Mr. Bevan in Smith's "Bible Dictionary" says: "It may equally well apply to the process of fermentation, or to the frothing of liquor freshly pressed out, in which case it might be used as an unfermented liquid."

*Ashisha* occurs four times. In Cant. 2 : 5 it is rendered simply "flagons;" in the other three instances it is rendered "flagons of wine." It is conceded on all hands to mean not wine at all, but a cake of pressed raisins. It therefore denotes a solid and not a liquid.

*Dam-anabim.* This expression occurs in Gen. 49 : 11, and is rendered in our English Bible "blood of grapes," and in the singular *Dam-enab* "blood of the grape." Deut. 32 : 14.

*Shemarim* "preserves," the plural of *shemar.* In Is. 25 : 6, where the term occurs twice, it is rendered "wine on the lees," but the literal meaning of the passage is, "a feast of fat things, a feast of preserved things," and the natural inference is that the term answers to our English "preserves." Coverdale renders "sweet things;" the Bishop's Bible "delicate things;" Grotius "a feast of vine-fruit" (*vindemia*). Preserves form an essential part of oriental feasts. "They eat the fat (shemen) and drink the *sweet.*" Neh. 8 : 10. In Ps. 75 : 8, where it is rendered "*dregs,*" it signifies the thicker, hence sedimentary part of the mixture, which had not been perfectly combined with the rest.

*Yeqeb.* This word means literally, wine-press or vat, but is rendered in the authorized version "wine," once, Deut. 16 : 13. The phrase should read, "In the gathering from the floor and from the press."

*Mesek* "a mixture," is of course applicable to many mixtures, of wine with water, or with aromatics or with drugs. It signifies wine compounded with some other ingredients, but whether drugged or diluted is not necessarily indicated.

*Anabim.* This word means literally "grapes," but in one instance is rendered "wine," under the mistaken notion of the meaning of ashishah, with which it is immediately connected in the same passage. Hos. 3 : 1.

"Coming now to the New Testament we find five Greek terms used for beverages made from the grape and other fruits, but of these only two are in any instance rendered "wine" in our English version."*

*Oinos.* This word occurs thirty-two times, and has the same

*Leon C. Field.

generic sense in the New Testament that *yayin* has in the Old. In the New Testament usage it comprehends "new wine," *oinos neos*, Matt. 9 : 17; Mark 2 : 22; "sweet wine" *gleukos*, Luke 10 : 34, and "sour wine," Mark 15 : 23.

*Sikera*, occurs but once, Luke 1 : 15, and is a literal rendering of the Hebrew *Shechar* and like that is doubtless used generically for all kinds of beverages made from other fruits than the grapes.

*Oinos neos.* This word is used nine times in the New Testament and in each instance rendered "new wine." It is a general term for grape juice recently expressed and unfermented; it may have included that also which had begun to ferment.

*Oxos.* This word occurs six times in connection with the account of the crucifixion, and is in each case rendered "vinegar." It was a wine which had completed the acetous fermentation and was sour to a proverb (Prov. 10 : 26). It was serviceable for the purpose of sopping bread as used by laborers, Ruth 2 : 14. To this day the harvesters in Italy use a similar article called *sera* and *pesca.* In hot climates it formed, when diluted, a very refreshing draught, but was not intoxicating.

*Geneema Tees Ampelou.* This expression is employed three times in connection with the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper and is rendered "fruit of the vine." It signifies the first and simplest produce of the grape, the fresh juice.

Rev. Leon C. Field sums up the inquiry into the meaning of the terms for wine in the Scriptures, as follows:

1. There are eleven words in the Old Testament and two in the New, which are rendered in our English Bible by wine, either singly or in connection with some other word.

2. There are five other terms in the O. T. and four in the N. T., which refer to the juice of the grape or of other fruits in some form, so that

3. There are in all in the O. and N. Testaments twenty-two terms which are applied to the products of the grape or of other fruits.

4. But of these twenty-two terms, there are five which have no reference whatever to the juice of the grape or to the juice of any fruit; one, *tirosh*, denotes the vine-fruit in its natural

solid state; another *shemarim*, denotes the insoluble dregs of the wine, or, more probably, "preserves" or confections; another, *enab*, denotes simply the grape; and the fifth, *yeqeb*, denotes simply the wine-press.

5. Of the remaining seventeen words and phrases which do refer to the juices of fruits, three Hebrew terms, *yayin*, *shechar*, and *chemer*, and two Greek terms, *oinos* and *sikera* are generic. One Hebrew term *chometz* and one Greek denote a wine that has entered the acetic state of fermentation. One Hebrew term, *mesek*, denotes a wine, either fermented or unfermented, which has been drugged or diluted. And six Hebrew terms, *asis*, *sobe*, *dam-anabim*, *mish-rath-anabim*, *debash* and *mamtaqqim*, and three Greek terms, *gleukos*, *oinos neos*, *geneema tees ampelou*, denote some form of unfermented grape or other juice.

6. With the exception of one Hebrew and one Greek word, which designate a beverage that has entered the acetic stage of fermentation, there is no term in the O. T. or the New, which invariably indicates a fermented liquor, while there are nine which signify an unfermented article, and six others the most important, and by far the most frequently used, which leave us absolutely free to decide, by reference to the context or other circumstances of the case, whether or not a fermented wine is intended.

Thus we see that the Scriptures distinguish between these two kinds of wine by the words which they employ to designate them. They discriminate and describe them with an accuracy and affluence of terms which is remarkable, when we remember that the Hebrew is comparatively a meagre language.

III. We come now to another part of our subject; namely, to prove that wine can be kept in a sweet and unfermented state, and the fact that the ancients, as well as the moderns, understood and practiced the art of keeping wine unfermented.

Some years ago a Rev. A. M. Wilson, of London, England, wrote a book in which he undertook to prove "that it must have been simply impossible for the ancients to have preserved their juice liquid and unfermented, unless they had boiled it in air-tight flasks, &c. But they trode their grapes in an open wine-press, in the open air, so that fermentation was inevitable," thus

assuming that fermentation is immediate on exposure of grape juice to the air.

This book was extensively circulated and had a two-fold effect: It was quoted by some Christians as an argument against the tee-total temperance movement, on the ground that Mr. Wilson had proved the preservation of unfermented wine to be impossible, and therefore the Bible sanctioned the use of intoxicating liquors. But it was also quoted by infidels against the Bible, who said, "Can a book be true, or can its asserted Inspirer be infallible, when in it liquids which every man of science, or medical practitioner, knows to be artificial poisons, are explicitly commended and unstintingly approved of?"

Mr. Wilson's book was reviewed and refuted by an eminent scientist, Norman Kerr, M. D., F. L. S., also of London, who says: "I have read the whole volume with care and attention, and have found the entire argument based upon a misunderstanding of popular chemical deliverances, a misunderstanding which could never have arisen, had the author been skilled in organic chemistry."

Dr. Kerr says, Fermentation is *not* immediate. It sometimes begins in a few hours, sometimes not for days. Grape juice, freely exposed to the air in my dining room, mean 60 deg. Fah. did not ferment for four and a half days."

There are three kinds of fermentation designated in chemistry:

1. The *alcoholic*, or *vinous* fermentation, that which is accompanied by the formation of alcohol;

2. The *acetous* fermentation, that which is accompanied by the formation of vinegar;

3. The *lactic* fermentation, that by means of which milk sours and curdles.

It is only with the first, the alcoholic fermentation, that we have to do in this discussion, the acetous and lactic do not intoxicate.

The ancients could easily, as many wine cultivators at the present day, have preserved their wine unfermented and non-alcoholic by several simple processes. Some of these processes, described by Dr. Kerr, we will now briefly indicate:

1. *Cold.* Fermentation does not take place at a temperature below 40 Fah. If the juice be kept at this temperature it will not ferment. "I have known," says he, "a quantity kept in a cold cellar in Britain over a whole winter without a sign of fermentation.

The following is quoted from Prof. Ramsey: "When it was desired to preserve a quantity of pure grape juice in the sweet state, an *amphora* was taken and coated with pitch within and without; it was filled with mustum lixivium (wine pressed before the grapes were fully trod), and corked, so as to be perfectly air tight. It was then immersed in a tank of cold water, or buried in wet sand, and allowed to remain for six weeks or two months. The contents after this process were found to remain unchanged for a year, and hence the name of *aci gleukos*, or always *must.* (Smith's Dict. of Greek and Rom. Ant. Art. Wine, p. 1202; Columella, b. xii., c. 29; Pliny, Nat. Hist. b. xiv., c. 9.

Dr. Kerr says, "I quote the account of the respected professor, my teacher, as he occupied a leading position amongst the highest classical authorities of the century, and no one will question the accuracy of his translation. Pliny says: "Id evenit cura, quoniam fervere prohibitur: sic appellant musti in vina transitum"—This comes about through care, forasmuch as fermentation is prevented: so they call the passage of must into wine. (Pliny ibid).

The modern application of this method of keeping wine unfermented and unintoxicating was thus detailed by Philip Miller, F. R. S. in 1769: "The way to keep wine long in the must, is to tun it up immediately from the press, and before it begins to work, to let down the vessels, closely and firmly stopped, into a well or deep river, there to remain for six or or eight weeks, during which time the liquor will be so confirmed in its state of crudity as to retain the same, together with its sweetness, for many months after, without any sensible fermentation." (The Gardner's Dict. 8th ed. Art. Wine).

True history ever repeats itself, and as we follow Miller, we almost seem to be reading Columella or Pliny.

2. *Heat.* a. Below boiling point, with exclusion of air. Fermentation cannot take place above 113 deg. Fah. (Miller El. of Chem).

b. At boiling point with exclusion of air. If unfermented grape juice be enclosed in an air-tight vessel and heated in boiling water fermentation will be rendered impossible. (Gmelin Chem., by Watts, vii. 100; Watts ii. 625).

c. Below boiling point with free exposure to air. "Mr. Clifford and I heated grape juice daily to 180 deg. Fahr., or 32 deg. below boiling point, leaving the vessel quite open in an atmosphere full of yeast germs, and, after five weeks, found the liquid totally devoid of alcohol." Dr. Kerr, p. 17.

d. At boiling point with free exposure to air. If pure juice of the grape be exposed once a day to a boiling heat, without being protected from the air, fermentation may be prevented for any length of time. (Gmelin vii. 100; Watts ii. 625).

These statements are confirmed by Lewis Pasteur, who has been pronounced the most successful scientist in chemical and physical matters. The following is given as the result of his experiments in the *Scientific American* of Nov. 4, 1884: "He [Pasteur] conceived the idea of making experiments to ascertain whether yeast germs, fermentation, mould, &c. could originate of themselves in fluids. His experiments proved beyond any doubt that this was not possible, and thus settled this question of long standing. He also discovered a method of preserving wine and beer by heating it for about thirty minutes to from 46° to 48° C., whereby the yeast germs are destroyed and prevent further decomposition of the liquid."

3. *Inspissation.* Grape juice boiled down to a half, a third or a fourth of its bulk, does not ferment for a very long time and then only slightly and on the surface. "The blood of the grape was poured warm into ordinary glass bottles, which were sealed, as wine bottles usually are, and it continued unfermented or free from alcohol to the last. And I had the pleasure, not long since, of enjoying a refreshing draught from a bottle of Eastern wine, more than four years old, which I found on chemical examination, absolutely non-alcoholic." Dr. Kerr.

4. *Evaporation*, or perfect dryness, prevents every kind of fermentation. (Watts ii. 635; Gmelin vii. 100). Mr. Buckingham (Travels among the Arab tribes, Lond. 1825, p. 137), was treated at Cufr Injey to cakes of wine which he describes as a

very curious article, probably resembling the dried wine of the ancients, quite hard and dry, in shape like a cucumber, capable of being kept fresh and good for many months—a welcome treat at all times, and particularly well adapted for sick and delicate persons, who might require some grateful provision that could be carried in small compass without risk of injury on a journey. He also describes this dried wine as having the consistency of portable soup. Nor is solidity or perfect dessication necessary, for fermentation demands a great degree of liquidity, taking place only when the solution is sufficiently diluted with water (Watts ii. 630)."

5. *Sulphurization.* The easiest method is to fill the cask nearly full of pure unfermented juice, then burn sulphur in the empty portion, and while the sulphurous fumes are present, close the cask tightly. This is the plan preferred and usually adopted by wine-growers now, and they have no difficulty in keeping copious stores of this unfermented wine. Many wine cultivators have a quantity of it always in stock.

"Not long ago," says Prof. James Miller, the eminent surgeon, "I made the acquaintance of an extensive wine grower on the Moselle. 'Have you any unfermented wine-juice of the grape?' said I. 'Tons,' said he. 'How old?' 'Some of it fully ten years.' And he went on to explain two modes of preserving it in its pure, natural, unfermented state; one by the boiling process, another by the sulphur cure—both precisely as practiced in olden times." (Nephalism, pp. 147, 148).

Most of these modes of preparing and preserving unintoxicating wine could easily have been practiced by the ancients. Minute directions still are extant for the absolute prevention of fermentation.

"This nineteenth century non-alcoholic wine," continues Dr. Kerr, "I prescribe largely in the treatment of such diseases as fever, consumption, and that most depressing malady, dispepsia, from one of the Protean forms of which Timothy may have suffered, when he received the prescription of probably a like wine from the apostle Paul." Such non-alcoholic wines are now extensively prepared in Europe and America. Some of the Luth-

eran churches in York and also of other denominations now use only unfermented wine at their communions.

IV. We come now to the question, What kind of wine did Christ use at the institution of the Lord's Supper? I have already quoted an expression written to me by a friend who tried to dissuade me from writing this article, "Wine is wine (fermented) and Christ made wine, drank it, and hallowed it at the institution of the Holy Supper." Dr. Crosby in his "Calm View of the Temperance Question," Dr. Moore in the *Presbyterian Review*, Jan. 1881, and Prof. Bumstead in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1881, all claim that Christ used fermented wine at the institution of the Holy Supper. Dr. Moore goes so far as to say, "He instituted the Holy Supper in wine on which unworthy communicants could get drunk."

In order to arrive at the truth on this subject three sources of evidence should be consulted:

1. The circumstances under which the Supper was instituted;
2. The language in which the event is recorded, and
3. The practice of those by whom the rite was perpetuated.

Under the first head we remark, The celebration of the Jewish Passover was the occasion of the institution of the Lord's Supper. It will not be disputed that the elements of the Passover furnished the emblems of the Holy Supper. The unleavened bread of the Passover was that which Christ brake and gave to his disciples at the supper; the drink in the cup of the Passover was the same as in the cup of the New Testament sacrament. But what was that drink? In all the statutes of the Mosaic law concerning the Passover there is nothing said about any kind of drink. The use of wine at the festival, it is supposed, was introduced after the Babylonian Captivity. The Saviour, however, sanctioned this custom by his own use of the Passover wine. It was the unalterable law of this festival, that nothing fermented should enter into its observance; and therefore it was called the feast of "sweetness, or of "unfermented things." Exod. 23 : 15. The law reads thus: "Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread, and in the seventh day shall be a feast to the Lord. Unleavened bread shall be eaten seven days; and then shall no leavened bread be seen with thee, nei-

ther shall there be leaven seen with thee in all thy quarters. Ex. 13 : 6, 7. This law is very explicit; nothing fermented was allowed to be partaken of during this festival, but everything that had been fermented, or that was capable of fermentation, must be rigidly removed from the dwelling. The Jews swept their houses from the top to the bottom, in order that not a particle of leaven might remain. It was designed for an object lesson of purification to the Jews. Fermentation is a process of putrefaction, and leaven is a substance in a state of putrefaction. It is therefore an emblem of moral corruption. Thus Christ bade his disciples, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," and Paul exhorts the Corinthians, "Purge out the old leaven." But in no form is this element of corruption more actively present, than in fermented wine, and the searching and sweeping law of the Passover must also have excluded it from the feast. It excluded not only fermented solids, but also fermented liquids.

The Jews have so understood the law. The rabbis have always interpreted it as excluding liquids. The Mishna expressly specifies certain fermented drinks, whose use would be a violation of the feast, and in general forbids all liquors made from grain. Of significance in this connection is the rabbinical ordinance that no Jew shall enter a place where wine or other fermented liquors are sold during passover week, and that if one of that race and religion be a vintner, he shall close out his whole stock, previous to the festival. (*Sunday Magazine* 1870, p. 730; art. Passover Observance). It is also important to observe, that distilled liquors have always been interdicted at the paschal supper. It is indeed claimed that in the things which, according to the Mishna, transgress the Passover, wine is not spoken of, nor any drink prepared purely from fruit. Maimonides and Bartinore, Spanish rabbis of the twelfth century, give the remarkable and false reason for this, that "the liquor of fruit does not engender fermentation, but acidity." (Chametz Vematzaha, v. 1, 2).

The views of modern Jews on this subject are conflicting and even contradictory. The reason, doubtless, is that there are two distinct parties among them; the one orthodox, the other lib-

eral or rationalistic. The former, who are strict in their interpretation of the law and in their observance of its requirements, rigorously exclude all fermented drinks from their passover. The latter, who are latitudinarian in doctrine and lax in practice, deny that the law of the Passover extends to wine. Many of this school place the wine of commerce on the paschal board; some neglect altogether the ordinance of their fathers; others rob the rite of all its significance by denying the supernatural character of the events which it commemorates. Thus, the Rev. J. N. Bruehl says, in regard to the raisin wine used by the Jews at the Passover, "They are perfectly indifferent about fermentation." Dr. Gottheil testifies, that "while the use of *fermented* wine is proper at the Passover, unfermented is permitted in certain cases." Dr. Moore in *Presbyterian Review*, Jan. 1882, pp. 90, 91.

But there is evidence on the other side of the strongest kind. Mr. Allen, an authority on all matters pertaining to Judaism, writes with reference to the Passover: "They (the Jews) are forbidden to drink any kind of liquor made from grain, or *that has passed* through the process of fermentation. Their drink is either pure water or raisin wine prepared by themselves. (Modern Judaism, 1882, p. 394). Dr. L. M. Isaacs, an eminent Jewish rabbi, and formerly chief editor of the *Jewish Messenger*, says, "The Jews do not in their feasts for sacred purposes, including the marriage feast, ever use any kind of fermented drinks. In their oblations and libations, both private and public, they employ the fruit of the vine, that is, fresh grapes—unfermented grape juice and raisins, as the symbol of benediction. Fermentation is to them always a symbol of corruption, as in nature and science it is itself decay, rottenness." (Quoted in Patton, Bible Wine, p. 83). Another leading rabbi of New York has recently testified that, "fermented wine, as everything fermented is rigidly excluded from our Passover fare, in accordance with the spirit of the divine command, Exodus 12 : 19." (*New Englander*, July 1882, p. 220). There is good reason for believing that the stricter, or orthodox view, prevailed in our Lord's day. Dr. A. Peabody says, that in our Saviour's time, the Jews, at least the high ritualists among them, extended the

prohibition of leaven at the Passover season to the principle of fermentation in every form, and that it was customary at the Passover festival for the master of the household to press the contents of the cup from clusters of grapes, preserved for this very purpose. (*Monthly Review*, Vol. xliii, p. 41). He who came not to destroy, but to fulfill (Matt. 5 : 17), could not ignorantly, and would not intentionally, have broken, or infringed the law, either in its letter or its spirit. He could not have celebrated the Passover in a wine which had undergone fermentation, and so had become a symbol of corruption.

2. We consider next, the language in which the institution of the Lord's Supper is recorded. This is preserved to us in the first three Gospels and the first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. The words of these records are largely the personal utterances of Christ himself .After mentioning the blessing and the breaking of the bread, the narrative continues: a. "And he took the cup and gave thanks." The reference, as most of the authorities agree, is to the third of the four cups at the Passover meal called "the cup of benediction." It was this cup with which the Christian ordinance was inaugurated. For it the great founder of the feast gave thanks, as he consecrated it to its new and holier uses. And, when it had been transferred to the sacramental table, it was still called "the cup of blessing." (1 Cor. 10 : 16). I quote here the pungent words of Leon C. Field in Oinos: "It is not necessary to suggest that 'the cup' is put by metonomy for its contents. They were the subject of thanksgiving, the medium of blessing. Such, indeed, would be the pure and nutritious juice of the grape. Such never could be the wine upon which God had poured his maledictions, and upon which he had warned his children not to look. We cannot conceive of Christ bending over such a beverage in grateful prayer. The supposition is sacrilegious. The imputation is blasphemous. No cup that can intoxicate is a cup of blessing, but a cup of cursing. It is not 'the cup of the Lord,' but, 'the cup of devils.' (1 Cor. 10 : 21). It does not belong to a eucharistic feast, but is the fit accompaniment to scenes of revelry and riot."

b. "And he gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it." Rome

has denied the sacramental cup to the laity, but Christ commanded his true disciples everywhere to drink of the sacramental cup. There is no exception, absolutely none. If the contents of the cup be the uncorrupted and nutritious juice of the grape, there need be none. But if the cup contains the fermented wine, which so many allege must only be used, then there are some of our Saviour's followers who can not and ought not to partake. Such a cup should never be put to the lips of one in whom the single taste, and sometimes even the mere smell of alcohol awakens a dormant or conquered appetite and becomes the initial step of a course of headlong dissipation and irremedial ruin. "There are some persons on whom the smallest quantity of alcohol seems to act like the taste of blood on a tiger, producing in them a wild desire for more, destroying all self-control. For them alcohol is a poison, and total abstinence the only safe guard." *Dr. Brunton.* Yet this has been the sad history of not a few souls. Dr. Duffield gives instances that came under his own cognizance. "One, a reformed drunkard, who went directly from the communion table to the tavern to satisfy his stimulated appetite;" another of a "minister of Christ who for ten years had tasted nothing stronger than water, save the wine in the communion cup, which he was in the habit of putting only to his lips through fear, thrown back by one mouthful of intoxicating drink when drenched with rain." Instances of this nature are numerous. "Can it be right," continues Dr. Duffield, "for the church in view of such things to put to the lips of her members the wine that intoxicates? Shall 'the cup of salvation' become the cup of damnation? Shall 'the cup of the Lord' be made identical with 'the cup of devils?' Assuredly the churches are bound to look into this matter, and have a care that the guilt and apostasy of some of their members be not induced 'by liquid damnation,' administered in the consecrated chalice."

c. "For this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." The blood of the paschal lamb was a type of the blood of Christ. At blessing of the passover cup the question and answer to this effect was repeated, "What is this? This is the blood of the lamb that was slain

when the angel of death passed over the dwellings of our fathers in Egypt." Jesus in instituting the New Testament sacrament says in effect, This is my blood, (not the blood of the paschal lamb, but the blood of the Lamb of God) that was shed, (not for the redemption of Israel only), but for the redemption of the world. The wine in the communion cup stands therefore as the symbol of the blood of Christ. But fermented wine could not suitably serve this purpose. It is not a proper symbol of blood in general. Its only resemblance to blood is its color, but as Meyer in his commentary, says, the whole point of the symbolism lay in its being *poured out.* In every other particular the argument is altogether with the unfermented wine, as so eminent an authority as Dr. B. W. Richardson has pointed out. He says:

"The constituent parts actually of blood and of the expressed wine are strikingly analagous. One of the most important elements of the blood, that which keeps it together, that which Plato speaks of as the 'plastic parts of the blood,' is the fibrine, and that is represented in the gluten of the unfermented wine. If we come to the nourishing part of the blood, that which we call the mother of the tissues, we find it in the unfermented grape, in the albumen, and that is also present in the blood; and if we count all the salts there are in the blood, the proportion is nearly the same in the unfermented wine as in the blood; and if we come to the unfermented parts of the wine which support the respiration of the body, we find them in the sugar. Really and truly, on a question of symbolism, if there be any thing at all in that, the argument is all in favor of unfermented wine." It must be remembered that fermentation destroys nearly all those useful and nutritious elements above mentioned in the pure grape juice and changes them into alcohol, a poison, and therefore entirely destroys its symbolism to the blood of Christ.

d. "But I say unto you, I will not henceforth drink of this fruit of the vine." It is remarkable that nowhere in the New Testament is the word *oinos*, wine, used with reference to the Lord's Supper, but always the words, "cup of the Lord," "cup of blessing," or "fruit of the vine." The words of the Saviour,

"fruit of the vine," could have no proper or possible application but to the juice of the grape in its natural state, just as it came from the cluster. It must mean, if it means wine at all, a purely unfermented wine. Fermented wine is not "the fruit of the vine." It is the fruit of disintegration and decay. "Alcoholic wine, then, is no more entitled to be called 'the fruit of the vine,' than any of the other cotemporaneous or subsequent products of its decay, such as carbonic acid, vinegar, yeast, volatile oils, œnanthic acid, or ammonia. To apply the phrase, "fruit of the vine," to any of the substances resulting from its decay, is just the same absurdity, as to call death the fruit of life." *Dr. Lees.*

We doubt not that Jesus, with divine wisdom, selected this term, "fruit of the vine," to designate the contents of the sacramental cup, that in all time to come no sanction might be found in his words for the use of a beverage manifestly unfit for the purpose of the Holy Communion.

e. "Until I drink it anew with you in my Father's kingdom." The advocates of the "one wine" theory understand Christ to be contrasting the *old wine*, which he was then drinking, with the *new wine*, which he was to drink with his disciples in the coming kingdom. According to this view Christ drank the old, the alcoholic wine, at the passover, but would drink the new, the unfermented in the kingdom of his Father, which is absurd; for the old was declared by Christ himself as better than the new, and they will certainly drink the better wine in the kingdom of God. But the real meaning is not that Christ will drink *new wine* with his disciples in the kingdom of God, but that he will drink it *anew*, in an adverbial sense. In this sense it is understood by Bengel, Meyer, Clarke and others. "We understand by this *new wine* of the coming kingdom," says Mr. Field, "a wine, which like that kingdom itself, will be of a kind and character utterly unknown to earth, a spiritual wine, as it is to be a spiritual kingdom. It is perhaps not unreasonable that it will be identical with what is elsewhere called 'the *water* of life.'" (Rev. 21 : 6; 22 : 1, 17).

3. *The Practice* of those by whom this ordinance was perpetuated, corroborates the position that the wine used at its institution was unfermented. Here we are met at once by Paul's

rebuke of the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11 : 20, 21), "One is hungry, another is drunken or surfeited." This passage, indeed, is the main reliance of those who insist that the wine of the Lord's Supper was alcoholic. Dr. Moore returns to it again and again to prove, "that the sacramental cup, containing 'the fruit of the vine,' could certainly intoxicate those who were guilty of drinking it immoderately." Dr. Poor also asks, "Is not this a valid argument in proof of the fact that the wine used at the Lord's Supper was such as could intoxicate?" We answer, by no means. The record does not refer to the Lord's Supper at all, but to the agapae, or love feasts, which were often associated with it. St. Paul distinctly declares, "This is *not* to eat the Lord's Supper," (1 Cor. 11 : 20). Prof. B., with justifiable sarcasm, puts the argument of the "one wine" theorists into this absurd shape, "Paul rebuked the Corinthians for getting drunk when they did *not* eat the Lord's Supper; it follows therefore, by irresistible inference, that when they *did* eat it, they used wine capable of making them drunk. *Presb. Review*, April 1882, p. 321.

But even if we should admit that the reference was to the Lord's Supper, it would merely indicate that at that early date *this* church had departed from the original custom of the feast, and had improperly introduced intoxicating liquor, and turned the holy sacrament into a drunken revel. It is certain that their sin, whatever it was, whether selfish surfeiting, or riotous drinking, and wherever committed, whether at the agapæ or the Eucharist, drew down upon them the unsparing condemnation of the apostle. It still further appears that some of the Corinthian church members had even dared to attend the festivals of the heathen gods (1 Cor. 10 : 19) and drink of the intoxicating wines which flowed so freely on these occasions. That drink St. Paul denounces as the cup of devils (1 Cor. 10 : 21), and puts it in startling contrast with "the cup of the Lord" (1 Cor. 10 : 21) which he had just called "the cup of blessing," (v. 16) and which with all the force of comparison is shown to be a totally different thing, an innocent and unintoxicating drink.

It is a notable fact that deviations from the primitive simplic-

ity and purity of Christianity and its institutions began already in the days of the apostles. Abuses and corruptions crept into the Church, gradually at first, but rapidly afterward, often obscuring, and often wholly obliterating the original intentions of the founder. In no instance was this tendency to perversion earlier or more extensively manifested than in that of the Lord's Supper. Notably among these perversions are the doctrine of transubstantiation, the adoration of the host, the transforming of the eucharistic feast into an expiatory rite and the withholding of the cup from the laity. The Romish Church, by whom all these abuses have been introduced and perpetuated, places the intoxicating cup upon the altars, and Protestantism, we are sorry to say, has not yet freed itself from this "relic of Popery." But how was it in the early ages of the Church? Some traces of adherence to the original custom certainly remain. One of the most important is found in the apocryphal "Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew," which was current in the second and third centuries of the Christian era. A passage in this work reads: "Bring ye also as an offering holy bread, and, having pressed the clusters from the vine into a cup, communicate with me, as the Lord Jesus showed us how to offer up, when he rose from the dead on the third day." (Clarke's Ante Nicene Christian Library. Translated from Acta Apostolorum, editor C. Tischendorf, Leipsic 1851, p. 185). This is clear and positive testimony as to the use of the freshly expressed juice of the grape in the celebration of the Lord's Supper at that early period. That the practice of pressing the grapes directly into the cup at the Supper was preserved, is still further apparent from the action of the third Council of Braga (A. D. 675) which relates Cyprian's words, correcting several other abuses that had crept into the celebration of the sacrament, among which it mentions, "Some even who presented no other wine at the Sacrament of the Lord's cup, but what they pressed out of the clusters of grapes." (Bingham, "Antiquities of the Christian Church," xv. 2, 3). Pope Julius I. says in his seventh decree (A. D. 337): But if necessary, let the cluster be pressed into the cup and water mingled with it." (Gratian Pars iii. "De Consecr" Dist ii. c. vii). This decree is quoted as authoritative

by Durandus in the thirteenth century, who says, "In case of necessity the cluster may be pressed before hand and the sacrament made therefrom; but with the unpressed cluster communion cannot be held." Thomas Aquinus in the same century also cited and confirmed this decree of Julius and added his testimony to the lawfulness and propriety of using unfermented wine at the communion. "Must has the specific nature of wine, and therefore this sacrament can be kept with must." The practice of mingling the wine with water, noticed by Justin Martyr, Cyprian, Clement of Alexandria, Basil, Gregory of Nyassa, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, Theodoret, and many other Greek and Roman writers, would have its origin, not necessarily in the weakening of alcoholic wine, but in the thinning of boiled wines and the thick juices of the crushed clusters.

In the twelfth century Johannes Belethus called attention to the practice of observing the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the freshly expressed juice of the grapes on the day of transfiguration. He says: "Let us notice that on this same day the blood of Christ is set forth from new wine, if it can be found, as from ripe grapes expressed into the cup." (Migne, "Patrol. C C.," v. 202). The evidence of ecclesiastical history on this subject, so far as the Latin Church is concerned, is well summed up by Scudemore, who says: "In case of necessity, the expressed juice has always been held to be wine for the purpose of the sacrament."

Within the pale of Oriental churches, where Christianity was first established, we find proofs of the long-established use of unfermented wine at the Lord's Supper. This is true of the Abyssinian Church. According to the traveler Bruce (Travels in Abyssinia, 1840, p. 24): "The Abyssinians received the holy Sacrament in both kinds, in unleavened bread and in grapes bruised with the husks together as it grows." Bishop Gobat of Jerusalem bears similar testimony as to the practice of this Church. (Journal of a Sojourn in Abyssinia). Tischendorf in his narrative of a visit to the Coptic monasteries of Egypt in 1846, writes: "Instead of wine they used thick juice of the grape which I at first mistook for oil." (Travels in the East," London 1844, p. 60). The Christians of St. John, who dwell

along the Jordan valley, and claim to have received the Gospel from the apostle John, according to the testimony of Baron Tavernier in the seventeenth century, used wine from dried grapes steeped in water, "in the consecrated cup." ("Travels in Persia," London 1677, p. 90). Similarly Thevenot says of his people, "As for the wine of their consecration, they make use of wine drawn from dried grapes steeped in water, which they express; and they use the same wine for moistening the flour whereof they make the host." (Travels in the Levant. London 1687, p. 164). The Nestorians of Western Asia, who date back as a sect to the fifth century, likewise employ the expressed juice of dried grapes in the celebration of the Eucharist.

Ainsworth in the account of his travels among that people in 1840 records that, "raisin water supplied the place of wine," the bishop administering the sacrament. Such is some of the evidence which we have of the use of unfermented wine in the observance of the Lord's Supper in the churches both of the East and of the West, from the earliest period of Christian history down to the present time.

We conclude therefore from our inquiry into the primitive customs of this ordinance, that our Lord did not use a fermented wine at its institution, nor did he command such an article to be employed in its observance, throughout the centuries which were to come. On the contrary, every thing points to the use and sanction of the simple, unfermented, nutritious juice of the grape.

We have now shown, most conclusively, that the Bible speaks of two kinds of wine, commending one kind as a blessing, and stigmatizing the other kind as a curse; that the Hebrew and Greek words of the O. and N. T. which are translated *wine* in our English Bible, clearly designate the fermented and the unfermented wines; that the ancients, as well as the moderns, knew how to preserve their wines unfermented, and did so preserve them; that the Passover wine, with which the Lord instituted the Holy Supper, was undoubtedly unfermented; that the Jews were in the habit of using unfermented wine at their Passover and other feasts, and the early Christians used unfermented wine at their communions; we have also shown from the words

of the institution of the Lord's Supper, that the pure unfermented "fruit of the vine," is the only appropriate emblem of the blood of Christ.

V. *Objections Answered.* We come now to answer some of the objections usually brought forward against what they are pleased to call "the exploded two-wine theory." A respected friend, in writing to dissuade us from preparing this article, uses these remarkable words: "The more there is written on it, it is demonstrated that wine is wine, and that our Lord made it, drank it, and hallowed its use in the Holy Supper." A more pitiful begging of the question in debate we have never seen. It assumes just exactly what is to be proven, namely, that the wine which Christ made, drank and used at the Holy Supper was intoxicating wine.

The marriage at Cana is adduced, where it is affirmed that Christ made intoxicating wine, after the guests "had well drunken," that is, had at least become partially intoxicated, and the ruler of the feast pronounced the wine, which the Saviour had made, better than that which the bridegroom had provided and the guests had been drinking, which must therefore have been stronger and more intoxicating. To this we reply, the word translated "well drunken" does not necessarily mean that they were intoxicated. The Greek word is *meethusthosi*, literally *well wined*, after they had drank wine, as much as they wished, till they were satisfied with wine, whether it was much or little. The expression has no reference either to the quantity or the quality of the wine. But even if we admit, (which we do not) that the wine which the guests at this feast had consumed, was intoxicating, that would not prove that the wine which the Saviour made was also, or still more intoxicating.

But the ruler of the feast pronounced the Saviour's wine the "good," which had in this instance been kept to the last, implying that it was better than that which they had been drinking. This is interpreted by the one-wine theorists as more intoxicating* But this does not follow. The quality of wine depends

---

**Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1881, p. 80. Dr. Moore in *Presbyterian Review*, Jan. 1881, p. 88.

not on the quantity of alcohol which it contains, but on various other circumstances.

There is great difference in the qualities of all kinds of wine, unfermented as well as fermented. 1. The quality depends very much on the climate in which the grapes were grown. The wine made from the grapes of Palestine was better than that made from the grapes of France or Germany, the wine made from the grapes of California is better than that made from the grapes of Pennsylvania.

2. There is also a difference in the quality of the wine from the different kinds of grapes that are used. Some contain more sugar than others, and of course are sweeter; some contain more gluten and are of course more nourishing. The wine must partake of the quality of the grapes from which it was pressed.

3. There is even a difference in the quality of the wine grown in different years in the same country. A warm and genial summer will produce a sweeter and better flavored wine, than a cold and moist summer.

4. There is also a difference in the quality of the wine even from the same kind of grapes depending on the manner in which it was manufactured. If the grapes are not fully ripe, or green grapes are mixed with the ripe ones, the wine will be acrid and sour. The juice which flows out during the treading, without pressure, is considered by far the best; it is the "first fruit;" it is sweeter and much more finely flavored than that which flows from heavy pressure, because here and there there are grapes not fully ripe, the pulps of which are sour, and affect the whole mass of the expressed juice more or less. The first flow from the vat without pressure was therefore considered the very best wine, and was also the most costly.

Now the family at Cana were doubtless poor people, like the holy family to whom they seem to have been related, and therefore could not afford to procure the best and costliest wine for their marriage feast, but used that which was cheaper, and usually drank by poor people. It is therefore not at all necessary to suppose that the wine which Jesus made was better than that which the bridegroom had provided, because it was more alcoholic or intoxicating, but it was better, because it was intrinsi-

cally of a superior quality, sweeter, more aromatic and pleasant to the taste, like the first free flow from the vat during the treading of the grapes. This, which all the guests, Christ included, could drink with perfect safety and pleasure, was the *good* wine, but the fermented, alcoholic, intoxicating wine is the *bad.*

In ancient times the quality that entitled wine to be called "good," was, that it would not intoxicate. The famous Lesbian wine of Horace was not intoxicating, and was extolled on that account. "The elder Cato, Varro, Columella and Palladius, with Pliny, form a succession of authors, extending from 150 years before to 130 years after Christ, who have not merely described various wines, but detailed the particular recipes for making them." *Dr. F. B. Lees.* The wine of Helbon and the wine of Lebanon were boiled juice of the grape, thick, sweet and syrupy. The wine of Cyprus is at this day sweet and thick as oil. Volney, after describing the unfermented and boiled sweet wines of Syria, adds, "Such are the wines of Lebanon, so boasted by Greek and Roman epicures." *Travels in Egypt and Syria,* p. 382. Dr. Jacobus says in his commentary, "All who know of the wines then used, will understand the unfermented juice of the grape. The present wines of Jerusalem and Lebanon, as we tasted them, were commonly boiled and sweet, without intoxicating qualities. *Those were esteemed the best wines which were least strong.*" Moses Stuart in his letter to Dr. Nott writes, "I regard it as established beyond fair contradiction, that it was a very common thing to preserve wine in an unfermented state, and that when thus preserved it was regarded as of a *higher and better quality* than any other." Gesenius, the Hebrew Lexicographer, says that the honey sent by Jacob to Joseph (Gen. 43 : 11) "was wine boiled down to the consistency of syrup." The boiling must have taken place before fermentation, since fermented wine cannot be boiled down to a syrup. Whatever it was, he calls it "wine."

In the miracle at Cana Christ exerted his creative power. St. Augustine makes these beautiful remarks: "For on that marriage day He made wine in six jars which He had ordered to be filled with water—He who now makes it every year in the vines. For, as what the servants had poured into the water jars was

turned into wine by the power of the Lord, so also that which the clouds pour forth is turned into wine by the power of the self-same Lord. But we cease to wonder at what is done every year; its very frequency makes astonishment to fail." So Chrysostom (Hom. 22, on John), "Now indeed making plain that it is He who changes into wine the water in the vines and the rain drawn up by the roots, He produced instantly at the wedding feast that which is formed in the plant during a long course of time."

There is no alcohol in the grape, because the sugar and albumen in the grape are contained in separate little bags and therefore fermentation cannot take place till these sacks are broken and the substances flow together; the grape left in its natural state may rot, but will not ferment. We conclude, therefore, from the analogy of nature that Christ as the Creator, who creates yearly the unfermented wine in the grape, also created unfermented wine at the marriage at Cana.

The next objection which we will notice is based on our Lord's allusion to wine in old and new bottles, or skins. "No man putteth new wine into old bottles, else the new wine will burst the bottles, and be spilled, and the bottles shall perish." The usual explanation of this passage is, that if new or unfermented wine were put into old bottles or skins, the expansion produced by fermentation would burst them, but new skin-bags being strong and elastic could resist the expansive force of the carbonic acid gas generated by fermentation. But this is an erroneous explanation, as will be evident by the following scientific statement:

"The expansive force liberated by fresh grape juice undergoing fermentation is enormous. A must, one-fifth sugar, developed 47 times its volume of carbonic dioxide, equivalent to a pressure of 34.3 atmospheres. This would be equal to 500 lbs. on a square inch, or ten times the pressure an ordinary high-pressure steam-engine has to withstand." (Thud and Dupre, p. 478).

Such a pressure must burst any bottle old or new, it must burst the strongest iron-bound vessel in which it could be placed. Of course it is presumed that the skins are closed after the wine

is put into them, for all kinds of wine will spoil if left any length of time exposed to the open air. If the bottles were left unclosed the wine would naturally ferment, both in the old and the new bottles, but it would not burst the old bottles any sooner than the new ones, for being open there would be no pressure upon them.

It is also assumed by our adversaries that the new wine spoken of by the Saviour is unfermented, because, as they assert, the fermentation would burst the old bottles, but the new bottles could resist the force of the fermentation by reason of their strength and elasticity. Here they unwittingly upset their "one-wine" theory, wherein they contend that the unfermented juice of the grape is not wine. Yet the Lord calls it wine, *oinos*. Fermented wine could have been put into air-tight skin bottles both old or new as there would have been no further pressure produced by fermentation. Dr. Lees gives this explanation of the passage in his Bible Commentary: "The facts stated by the Saviour are only intelligible in the light of the efforts used by the ancients to prevent grape juice from fermenting, by straining the juice, so as to free it from much of its gluten, and then bottling it with sulphur fumigation; or by subjecting the juice to a boiling heat, which checks all incipient fermentation, and then inclosing it in bags or other vessels made air-tight. It is obvious, that to render these precautions effectual the *wine-bags themselves* must have been free from ferment; and there was no other way of insuring the absence of ferment, save by being perfectly *new* skin-bags. If old bags were used, some of the albuminous matter adhering to their sides must, by the action of air have become changed into leaven or ferment; or by long wear and heat, cracks or apertures admitting the air might exist undetected, and the wine thus set a-fermenting, would in due course burst the skin, and be spilled and "lost;" but if the wine was poured into bags made of skins never before used, no provocation to fermentation would be present, and both the wine and the bags would be preserved—the wine from fermentation, the bags from rupture, otherwise sure to result from the elastic gas generated in fermentation making a violent effort to find vent."

In Luke 5 : 39 we have this passage immediately following that of the new wine in new bottles: "No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new, for he saith the old is better." The advocates of the "one-wine" theory, must consistently paraphrase this passage as follows: "No man having drunk old, that is fermented, intoxicating wine, will immdiately wish to drink new, that is unfermented, unintoxicating wine, for he will say, the old alcoholic, intoxicating wine is better than the new unintoxicating wine," and thus they represent the Saviour as assigning to old, fermented wine a superiority over the unfermented.

But this was by no means the estimate held in the Saviour's time in regard to the quality of fermented and unfermented wine. The sweet, unfermented wine was regarded better than the fermented and intoxicating wine. And they were right in their estimate. For new wine, when preserved by close confinement in new bottles till it is old, retains in perfection all its original properties, and acquires a lusciousness that enhances its value to the user. Dr. Lees says in a foot-note to his Bible Commentary, p. 294, "Mr. Wright's Passover wine is found to improve in flavor by keeping, though no chemical change, and certainly no fermentation, occurs. An explanation may be found in the fact, that the original aromas of the grape, fine and subtle particles, being by the act of crushing mingled with the saccharine and albuminous matters, become *less perceptible to the palate;* but by being kept, they mechanically separate again, and so impart a fuller and distincter flavor by touching the nerves of taste." Historically it is unquestionable that many of the oldest wines, and such as were most esteemed, acquired a thickness and sweetness that made their extreme dilution imperative in order to their being drunk. Aristotle testifies that the wines of Arcadia were so thick that they dried up in their goat-skins, and that it was their practice to scrape them off and dissolve the scrapings in water. Some of the celebrated Opimian wine, mentioned by Pliny, had in his day, two centuries after its production, the consistency of honey. In the light of these facts it is easy to understand the Saviour's declaration: "The old is better than the new."

Another objection is based on the parallel passages in Matt. 11 : 18, 19, and Luke 7 : 33–35, where the enemies of Christ are represented as calling him "a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber." (*Oino potees*, a wine-drinker). The implication is, that Christ drank intoxicating wine, and that a good man could not drink intoxicating wine without bringing a stigma upon his character. When a temperance advocate is now charged with drinking wine, the object is to injure his character and reputation; to show that he dishonors his profession. But does the assertion of his enemies prove that Christ was guilty of this charge? The one-wine theorists will have to say that he was guilty, for they maintain that he made and drank intoxicating wine; but we maintain that it was a malicious slander, such as they had uttered against him on other occasions, when they said, for instance, that he was a Samaritan and had a devil, or when they ascribed his miracles to Beelzebub, the prince of devils. So they also slandered John Baptist, because being a Nazarite, he drank no wine of any kind, they said, "he hath a devil." But John had no demon, neither was the food and drink which Christ consumed calculated, like the alcoholic liquors now in use, to engender an intemperate appetite, and rob man of his princely dower of reason and spiritual affection. Christ dismisses the slander by the simple remark, "Wisdom is justified of her children," which implies, you, my disciples, are acquainted with my manner of life, and can justify me against the base slanders of mine enemies.

Another text of Scripture perverted by the advocates of alcoholic drinks is 1 Tim. 4 : 11, "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused." "Alcohol is a good creature of God," say they. But we say it is no creature of God at all. Alcohol does not exist in nature. Prof. Turner says, "It does not exist ready formed in plants, but is the product of the vinous fermentation." (El. Chem., 2d ed., p. 664). Sir Humphrey Davy says of alcohol, "It has never been found ready formed in plants." (Agricul. Chem. 6th ed., p. 126). Chaptal says, "Nature never forms spirituous liquors, she rots the grape upon the branch, but it is *art* which converts the juice into intoxicating wine." (Le Art de Faire le Vin., p. 2, Paris, 1819). Prof. Lie-

big and other eminent chemists concur in the foregoing view. Alcohol is not a creature of God in any other sense than arsenic is. Rev. Dr. Guthrie of Edinburg, says, "I have heard a man with a bottle of whiskey before him have the impudence to say, 'Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving;' and he would persuade me that what was made in the still-pot was a creature of God. In one sense it is so; but in the same sense so is arsenic, so is oil of vitriol, so is prussic acid. Think of a fellow tossing off a glass of vitriol and excusing himself by saying, it is a creature of God. Alcohol is good in its own place. There is nothing like it in the world for preserving a man when he is dead. But it is one of the worst things for preserving a man when he is living. If you want to keep a dead man, put him in alcohol. If you want to kill a living man, put the alcohol into him."

The fallacy of the plea, "It is the *abuse*, and not the *use* of intoxicating liquors which the Bible prohibits," is apparent from the foregoing remarks. As Bible temperance is the moderate use of *good* things, and abstinence from *evil* things, *any use* of that which is injurious must be an abuse of it. Besides, it is not the *abuse* of wine that is called "a mocker," but wine itself. Solomon does not teach us to avoid the *abuse* of wine, or not to drink it to excess, but not to "look upon" it. The "abuse" theory is the merest twaddle. Were it correct, a multitude of moderate sins might be defended." Rev. W. M. Thayer.

"Equally fallacious is the plea that good men like Noah and Lot used wine. So great men practiced polygamy, and upheld slavery; but their example does not make those sins virtues. Good men now do some naughty things, and so long as human nature is imperfect we shall not be surprised by the fact, though we must not be led into sin by their example. The Bible nowhere commends a good man for drinking intoxicating wine as a beverage, or for doing any other wrong act." *Ibid.**

---

*The class of Biblical interpreters who perpetrate such perversions of Scripture as have above been refuted well deserve the ridicule, which the celebrated Robinson of Cambridge in his "Notes to Claude," has poured upon a set of clergymen in his day who, no doubt, had such views of Bible temperance as our modern one-wine theorists now have. He says:

But did not the apostle Paul advise Timothy to "take a little wine for his stomach's sake and often infirmities?" This, as the advocates of the "one-wine" theory maintain, must have been fermented, alcoholic wine. Timothy, they say, was in ill health, probably dyspeptic, and needed a stimulant. We reply, if Timothy actually needed medicine, and alcoholic wine was that medicine which he needed, it does not follow that Christians now are commanded in the Bible to use this medicine as a beverage, and much less that we should use this *medicine* in the communion of the Lord's Supper. I am aware that physicians in our day frequently prescribe alcoholic drinks to their patients, such as porter, ale or wine, but alas, the remedy often proves worse than the disease. I have in mind now two prominent Lutheran ministers, one the immediate successor of the other in the same church, who on their physician's advice, took a *little* ale every day, but gradually a *little* did not suffice, and the dreadful end need not be described. Now, the question is, Did the apostle Paul, guided by Divine inspiration, prescribe to his beloved Timothy, as some of our modern doctors do, the daily use of a little alcoholic wine as a stimulant? I trow not. Some of the highest medical authorities discourage the use of alcohol in the cure of disease. "Chemical experiments have demonstrated," says Prof. Youmans, of New York, "that the action of alcohol on the digestive fluid is to destroy its active principle, the pepsin, thus confirming the observation of physiologists, that its use gives rise to the most serious disorders of the stomach and the most malignant aberrations of the entire economy. It is evident that, so far from being a conservator of health, alcohol

---

"Reverend brethren! let me advise you to get drunk. You will perhaps think me doubly drunk in giving you such advice. But good men *have* got drunk. Noah was a good man; Lot was a good man; yet they both got drunk. You tell me, our Lord said, "Be not *overcharged* with drunkenness." Mind, he did not say, Do not get drunk, but be not *overcharged* with it. Now, can't you get drunk without being *dead* drunk? But you reply, St. Paul says, 'be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess.' Observe here, again, he does not say, Be not *drunk*, but, 'Be not *excessively* drunk.' Observe, too, he says, 'Be not drunk with *wine*,'—he doos not prohibit spirits. So you may get drunk on beer, or brandy, even to excess, without violating this injunction."

is an active and powerful cause of disease, interfering with the respiration, the circulation, and the nutrition; nor is any other result possible."

But the unfermented wine is nutritious, of easy digestion, sets light upon a weak stomach when taken in small quantities, quickly and readily assimilates, and as a means of distributing nutriment, is, by skillful physicians who know its virtues, often prescribed to persons in feeble, delicate state of health. Dr. Norman Kerr, of London, says, "I prescribe largely in the treatment of such diseases as fever, consumption, and that most depressing malady, dyspepsia, from one of the Protean forms of which Timothy may have suffered when he received the prescription of probably a like wine from the apostle Paul."

"In Syria the *juice* of ripe grapes inspissated, is used in great quantities in diseases." "It may be observed that, in infirmities dependent either upon excessive wear and tear, or upon some defective supply of the salts of the blood, pure wine (*i. e.* the juice of grapes unfermented) is the very best restorer, since it is rich in digestive albumen, and in phosphoric acid and the alkaline carbonates. Dr. Churchard of the *wein-cur* at Vevey, also says that it restores digestion and acts beneficially in bilious affections." *Dr. Lees.*

That the ancients preserved and used unfermented wine has been abundantly proved. Pliny's account of wines (book xix), shows that some sorts in good repute were not fermented; and of *adunamon* ('without strength'), one of the artificial *vina* (wines), he expressly declares that it was given to invalids when the ordinary wines were deemed likely to be injurious. He says, "The sweet wine (*glukos*), which among the Sicilians is called Pallion, may be the same as the *biblinos oinos*" (lib. i. chap. 56). Of the sweet Lesbian he says, "Let him take *glukos*, either mixed with water, or warmed, especially that called *protopos*, as being very good for the stomach." (lib. ii. chap. 24).

A number of years ago friends of the writer of this article, then living in Baltimore, Md., spent some time in Germany to avail themselves of the grape cure as a remedy against an ailment. They were required by the physician to eat a certain quantity of grapes every day.

Dr. Pereira speaks of grapes as "allaying thirst and checking febrile heat, and as of great use in the inflammatory form of dyspepsia." (Food and Diet, by Lec., p. 171.)

As I write these lines I have on my table before me, a preparation called "Sal Muscatelle," salt of the muscatelle grape, or the grape cure, the great hygienic resolvent of the blood. It is contained in bottles and sold in the drug stores. "It contains," says the label, "all the saline qualities of muscatelle grapes." "Health-giving, pleasing, cooling, refreshing beverage." "No one acquainted with the present state of science and art of medicine, will for a moment question that to prevent disease is its first and most important aim."—*Sir Wm. Jenner.* "No one can have a simpler or more efficient corrective of the system; by its use the poison is thrown off and the blood restored to its healthy condition."—*Doctor Clark.*

Truly the one-wine theory receives no support from Paul's advice to Timothy.

VI. It remains yet to make a few remarks on the moral aspects of this question.

1. Look at the moral inconsistency of using alcoholic wines at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. In these days of increased light on the temperance question it would be regarded a great breach of Christian propriety for a minister of the gospel, or even a Christian layman, to keep intoxicating wines on his table and offer them to his family and guests as a beverage. In some churches such conduct would be regarded as a proper subject for church discipline. But the one-wine theory would compel us to set this intoxicating drink on the Lord's table and administer it to the communicants. Is it proper for a Christian to drink such a kind of wine at the Holy Supper, which it would be scandalous for him to drink at his own table or at a social repast?

2. Look at the incongruity of using intoxicating wine at the Holy Communion. On Saturday evening before communion deacon Jones or Brown takes a jug, goes to the nearest liquor store or tavern and gets it filled with alcoholic wine to be drank by Christians on the following Lord's day—at the Holy Supper. Before the deacon gets away with his jug a bloated drunkard

also comes with his jug and gets it filled with strong drink, to be used on the same Lord's day in a bacchanalian carousal. In the one case the same kind of liquor, drawn perhaps from the same barrel, is regarded as a cup of blessing, in the other it becomes a cup of devils. Is this not abhorrent to our Christian feelings? Can the same fountain bring forth sweet and bitter waters? Said a country pastor, "I never was so mortified, as when after preparatory services on Saturday afternoon the deacon took a jug, with a corn cob in it for a stopper, and went to the tavern to have it filled with wine for communion on the next day."

3. The use of alcoholic wine is a stumbling block to the world. The world reasons logically: If the Church uses intoxicating wine at her most solemn feast, it can be no sin for us to use it at our social gatherings.

4. As already intimated in the discussion, the use of intoxicating wine at the Holy Supper becomes a dangerous snare to Christians who were once addicted to the use of strong drink, but have become reformed and now abstain entirely from everything that can intoxicate. The taste of only a drop, or even the smell of alcoholic liquor, has been known to turn such men back to their former degradation. Shall the Church in her Holy Communion hold the cup with the poison of the serpent in it to the lips of her weak brethren? No, let her give them the pure, uncorrupted fruit of the vine, in which there is no poison and no snare.

5. See lastly in what an immoral light the one-wine theory presents the character of the Lord Jesus, especially at the marriage of Cana. We maintain that on this occasion the Saviour made a large quantity of delicious, nutritious, unintoxicating wine. There could be no sin or danger in drinking it; it was a benefaction to the poor family; what was not consumed at the feast could be kept for future use or sold to supply future needs. But on the one-wine theory the case looks dark indeed. It assumes that the bridegroom had provided, as he thought, a sufficient quantity of intoxicating wine, but before the feast was ended the guests had consumed it all, and as a consequence had become "well drunken." Then the Saviour, instead of reprov-

ing them for their intemperance, as every true minister now would do, made a large quantity of better, that is stronger, still more intoxicating wine for their use on the same festive occasion. Think of it, "six water-pots containing two or three firkins apiece * * filled up to the brim." Alford reckons the total at 126 gallons. What must be the natural result? A drunken revel. A true minister of Christ in our day would not feel easy, if he were at a wedding where intoxicating wine was flowing freely, and if he could not prevent it, he would get away as soon as possible. But what would we think of a minister who not only approved of the intemperate drinking of the guests after they had drank all that had been provided, supposed to have been a sufficient quantity for the occasion, would of his own accord provide a large quantity of a still more intoxicating beverage to be consumed by the same guests. We would say, he had disgraced his office. Christians could have no respect for him. Even the world would despise him. We confess, before we had studied the Bible wine question it was hard for us to understand the miracle at Cana, or to read it with comfort to the congregation; we had preached the duty of total abstinence to them, and here we were reading the account of a wedding feast at which the guests had already "well drunken," consumed all the wine that had been provided, and yet the Lord Jesus was making a much larger quantity of wine in order to keep up the drinking. Some of the advocates of fermented communion wine, feeling the crushing weight of these considerations, undertake to apologize for the Saviour somewhat in this style: "If Jesus had lived in our day he would doubtless have been a temperance man, a total abstainer from all intoxicating drinks. But he lived in a remote age of the world, at a time when the temperance question had not yet been agitated, when every body drank, therefore he accommodated himself to the drinking customs of the people among whom he lived." We pity the men who have no better Christ than this. Such a Christ might do for a rationalist or an infidel, but could not satisfy a Christian, who believes in the divine nature and sinless character of his Saviour. We want a Christ that needs no apology, for whose

acts we must not blush with shame, but whose example is worthy of our imitation and highest admiration in all ages—in all lands —to the end of time.

## ARTICLE II.

### THE EVOLUTION OF RELIGION.

By DAVID J. HILL, LL. D., President of the University at Lewisburg, Pa.

During the last three hundred years there has been growing in the minds of men what David Strauss calls a "cosmic conception," an enlarged and coherent consciousness of what the universe actually is. The study of nature has built up this new idea in the human mind. The notion of Copernicus, that our earth is a globe revolving about the sun and not an extended plane bounded by a rimless ocean, was confirmed by Galileo's discovery of the moons of Jupiter and the phases of Venus and afterward by a hundred other facts, until now it is no longer heresy to believe it but madness to doubt it. The discovery of the planet Neptune by Adams and Leverrier convinced mankind that astronomy was a science of mathematical exactness, whose conclusions could not be disputed. The theory of Laplace, by which the systems of worlds are conceived as originating from nebulous matter, sweeping through space in vast cyclones, is almost universally accepted by competent scientists.

> "Erst, space was nebulous;
> It whirled, and in the whirl the luminous milk
> Broke out in rifts and curdled into orbs—
> Whirled and still curdled, till the azure rifts
> Severed and shored vast systems, all of orbs.
> Each orb has had its history. For ours,
> It blazed and steamed, cooled and contracted, till,
> Tired of mere vaporing within the grasp
> Of ruthless condensation, it assumed
> Its present form, proportions, magnitude—
> Our tidy ball, axled eight thousand miles."

The age of the earth is no longer measured by the span of six thousand years. We must play with the millions before we can strengthen our imaginations for the task of thinking of ge-

ological time. The children of life are now known as myriads, ranging from the simple plasson of the biologist's laboratory to the extinct mammoth, with the common housefly as a mid-way standard of measure. Thus the whole conception of existence has been changed. The known vastness of the universe overwhelms the most expanded imagination. The duration of it makes the brain reel with the dizzy thought of an endless succession of phenomena. In this vast machine, which men have discovered the universe to be, the mind seems to have come upon something infinite and eternal, something absolute and self-existent, and yet something blind, irresistible, pitiless,—not God, but Impersonal Force.

As this conception has been slowly elaborated through these three centuries, men of a speculative turn have been struggling to rise to an all-inclusive generalization of the truth concerning it. There are two diametrically opposed tendencies of mind which, by two antagonistic methods, have attained contradictory results. The idealistic minds, working by a subjective method, have concluded that the ultimate essence of which the universe consists is spiritual, and their doctrine is Pantheism. This has, until recently, been the favorite course of thought in Germany. On the other hand, materialistic minds, working by an objective method, have concluded that the ultimate essence of which the universe consists is material, and their doctrine is Panphysicism. This has been the favorite course of thought in France. Both schools of thinkers have accepted the unity and continuity of all being as primary assumptions. Both have assumed the universality of law throughout the whole empire of existence. They differ, therefore, only as to the nature of the ultimate essence that underlies the phenomena of knowledge.

But another group of thinkers have held an undefined position, or at least have been reserved in stating it, midway between the Pantheistic and the Panphysicist schools. They have accepted the unity and the continuity of being and the universality of law, but have usually avoided a conclusion as to the nature of being, whether spiritual or material. This is characteristic of modern thought in Great Britain. Bacon insisted upon observation and induction from experience as the sources of

knowledge, without distinctly denying others. Hobbes denied other sources. Locke taught that we know material phenomena through the senses and mental phenomena through reflection, but not first principles. Hume maintained that we know nothing but appearances. The two Mills, James and John Stuart, really avoided the metaphysical question. Herbert Spencer avows and justifies Agnosticism, thus confining us to mere phenomena, and yet catches through the mists the dim outline of the Unknowable with sufficient distinctness to affirm that it is there, on the verge of the intellectual horizon, but cannot be known except as the limitation of knowledge.

All these schools of thought have arrived at agreement in this conclusion: all known being is one and is continuous; all phenomena rise out of previous phenomena in an order determined by inflexible law. This means that, whatever be the intrinsic nature of being, whether spiritual or material, whatever is, results from what has been, by natural predetermined sequence. This excludes at once and totally personality, providence and prayer. With the elimination of these three,—personality, providence and prayer,—religion is divested of its object of worship and of its sustaining hope and its help from above. It, therefore, becomes a mere cultus, a ritual, in short, a meaningless mummery, except for those who have not the cosmic conception, who alone can enjoy henceforth the luxury of faith. All alike, Pantheist, Panphysicist and Agnostic, bring us to this point, and either by identifying God with the universe, or by denying that He is, or by denying our power to know Him if He is, render religion an empty superstition.

Having eliminated God from the universe, these three forms of Naturalism must account for whatever is, without the miracle of creation. This Naturalism claims to do. For all three schools the law of being is natural evolution. Without interference or guidance, the universe unfolds itself along lines of necessary development, until it reaches its necessary blossom and fruitage in the life of man. The nebulous masses eddy down into globes, the globes cool into planets and moons, the planets segregate their surfaces into water and rock, the water wears the rock into soil, the ocean gives birth to life by the

chemical union of molecules held in solution, the plant climbs out of the ocean and fixes itself in the soil, the marine plant becomes a protozoon, environment reacts upon this first sketch of animal life, differentiation begins, growth develops, heredity transmits, selection preserves advantages in the struggle for existence, and at length man appears.

But in man there is a singular phenomenon that no animal exhibits, and it is universal. It is religion. Every where man looks up to something above him and worships it. The Evolutionist does not now deny this, for the facts are too convincing. The foremost naturalists admit that man is a religious being, that he *was* in the most primitive times of which we have positive evidence, and that no absolutely *ir*religious race now exists. If there be individual exceptions, they are either eccentric groups of savages—but not whole races,—cretins, microcephali and Evolutionists of the modern type. Indeed, some of the most eminent naturalists lay so much stress upon religion as a distinctive and universal characteristic of man that they define him as "the religious animal."

The Evolutionist is too much impressed with the presence of religion to suppose that it can be banished from men's minds by a naturalistic theory which merely accounts for man without admitting creation. He sees that religion *itself* must be accounted for. Its origin, persistence, universality and dominance are facts which the Evolutionist cannot deny, and, therefore, must take the trouble to explain. Herbert Spencer, Edward B. Tylor and Sir John Lubbock have devoted much ingenuity to the elaboration of this subdivision of the evolution-hypothesis. Let us see, in a rapid sketch, what they make of it.

The mental type of primitive man is found in the savage of to-day. To him all dreams are realities, and dream-land is, therefore, for him the spirit land, in which his thoughts differ from those of perception only in being dimmer and less coherent. His memories of his dreams are accepted by him and told in good faith as experiences in the spirit-land, and thus that shadowy realm becomes to him an object of unquestioning belief. In dreams his buried ancestor appears to him, a dim but actual presence, who can revisit and affect this visible world. His

grave is made an object of veneration and of frequent visitation. There his bereaved family go to receive the commands of the departed, for by the laws of association he is there more likely to appear to the dreamer. To mark the grave for ready resort and in honor of the dead, it is first surrounded with stones. As skill advances it is more elaborately marked, finally walled and covered. The grave has become a shrine, the shrine a temple. The reäppearing shade is not unaccompanied as he appears in dreams. There are in the spirit-land duplicates of vaguer sort of all that are in this. The dead chief will want his horse and dog in the spirit land. An altar is erected, the animal is slain, and, behold, sacrifice is instituted. Perhaps he will want his enemies for pleasure, or his wife to keep him company. These are offered and human sacrifice, said to be prevalent in primitive times, has begun. He is pleased with these offerings and will answer requests. These are made with the sacrifice and, behold! prayer has become a ceremony of religion. The hovering spirit imparts wise thoughts to his people. These are remembered and after a time recorded, and scriptures have arisen with men to interpret them. In the migrations of the tribe the grave is lost, but what matters it? the heavenly father is a spirit and he can go with his people. He leads their migrations, guiding and protecting them. He gives them victory in battle and glory among men. He is supposed to be fond of these and they are reflected in full measure as a prelude to prayer. Ascriptions of praise become the language of devotion. Religion is now established in the minds and hearts of men. A skillful priesthood perpetuates it against the current of unbelief. The doubter is ostracised and possibly condemned to death. Thus has arisen the awful institution which Wordsworth calls

> "Sacred Religion, mother of form and fear,
> Dread arbitress of mutable respect;
> New rites ordaining when the old are wrecked,
> Or cease to please the fickle worshiper."

Nature-worship easily develops from this primitive form of religion. The sun, the sky, the winds, the ocean, the clouds, day, night, time,—all seem to the untutored mind to be personal forces, full of life and energy, sometimes kindly favoring

and sometimes malignantly marring the plans of men. Hence, they too become objects of worship. They are propitiated by sacrifices, are entreated with prayers, are honored with shrines, and the grammatical gender of primitive names gives them the semblance of persons, until imagination weaves about them the vestures of poetry and mythology.

The play of the intellect opens a new development of religion. The mind finally discovers its power of abstraction. It fixes attention upon some quality or attribute inherent in concrete things or their relations, names it, treats it as real, and reasons about it as if it were a living thing. Sometimes attributes are combined into conceptions that have no being outside the mind itself. These conceptions are then personified, by that poetic tendency of the imagination that impels it to treat the creations of thought as if they were living beings; then, finally, drawn by the power that makes the ideal seem superior to the real, the mind apotheosizes the conception, and a new deity is added to the world's pantheon. The Romans were exceedingly prolific in such deification. "They had solemn abstractions mysteriously governing every human action. The little child was attended by over forty gods. Vaticanus taught him to cry; Fabulinus, to speak; Edusa, to eat; Potina, to drink; Abeona conducted him out of the house; Interduca guided him on his way; Domiduca led him home, and Adonea led him in. So, also, there were deities controlling health, society, love, anger, and all the passions and virtues of men."

The great historic religions, too, may be regarded as deifications of abstract conceptions. Buddhism is the apotheosis of Pity; Mohammedanism is the apotheosis of Fate; Judaism is the apotheosis of Providence; and Christianity is the apotheosis of Love. Thus religion has become more and more the product of metaphysics, until its results are so remote from all external reality that appeal to nature is made by the theologian only for the purpose of imparting a realistic content to a conception elaborated from the inner consciousness by a process of abstraction. We are taught by the Evolutionist to reject the old doctrine that God created man, in order to accept the new dogma that man has created his gods. We may not believe that

God created man in his own image, but that the Deity is merely the reflection of the human soul projected upon the screen of nature by the camera obscura of fancy, and thrown back upon the soul as a deceptive spectre, to be worshiped as its author. Religion is the substance to which the old story of Narcissus gives the outline; it is the worship of self-reflection in the pool of consciousness.

In passing to the criticism of this statement of the evolution of religion, which I surely have not stated to its disadvantage, I must remark that mere ingenuity is not a test of truth. Nothing is more easy than to invent plausible explanations of occurences, which, nevertheless, are not the true ones. Ingenious as the theory is, it exposes a violent break in that boasted continuity of nature which is an important assumption of the doctrine of evolution. From the starting-point in the primitive nebula to the appearance of man, all has been orderly, progressive, beautiful and intelligible. But with the culmination of this long effort, with the emergence from the animal state, or worse after man had made some advancement, degradation and confusion begin, and the supreme product of nature, the intellect that analyzes and comprehends itself and measures and weighs the universe that has evolved it, trembles with superstitious dread at the creations of its own fancy, permits itself to be dominated by the spectres of dream-land, offers human life on the altar which its own fear had builded, and plunges itself into a long nightmare of folly, crime and delusion.

There is another violation of the method of evolution. The theory rests upon the assumption that the true representative of primitive man is the existing savage. But why should we seek the type in the lowest specimens of the species? Do naturalists seek the most stunted and dwarfed examples of plants and animals, in which the realization of the type is frustrated, as illustrations of it? Do we seek the type of the modern man in the cretins and microcephali, the failures and spent shots of humanity? And if the savage be really the representative of primitive man, he is the living refutation of the evolution hypothesis, for he is a standing proof that such a being does not follow the course of progress that man has actually followed, and

that from such a type as evolution supposes evolution would not have taken place. The savage is still a savage.

But admitting that the existing savage illustrates the primitive man, the religion of the lowest savages is not that with which evolution commences its imaginary history. The lowest savages are *fetish-worshipers*, reverencing material objects, or charms, and not ancestor-worshipers. Comparative ethnology shows that ancestor-worship is a *late*, rather than an *early*, phase of religion. The Chinese, a people high up in the ethnological scale, are ancestor-worshipers; but according to the best accredited specialists in Chinese history the primitive religion was monotheism, the worship of the spirit of heaven. The facts are against the evolution theory as to the later phases also. Ancestor-worship has existed for three thousand years in China without producing the higher forms of religion that the Evolutionists claim are evolved out of it, and it still persists side by side with philosophic systems which ignore the supernatural altogether.

Not only is the theory fatally in want of confirming facts, but the whole history of man is against its assumptions. A review of races shows that the least intellectual are the least religious, and the most religious are the most intellectual, which would not be true if religion were only the persistence of Ghostism. All human progress has been stimulated and led by religion. Architecture, sculpture, painting and poetry are the direct off-spring of the religious sentiment, and their noblest achievements have been consecrated to her service. And yet, in the face of this array of facts, it is seriously pretended that this mighty impulse that has gathered strength with the development of mind until the loftiest religious devotion has connected itself with the keenest intellect,—this impulse that has converted speech into poetry, imitation into art, and carving into literature—this impulse that has transformed selfishness into self-sacrifice and softened passion into prayer; had its origin in the cerebral perturbations of a dreamer, who had eaten a bad supper and dreamed of his grandfather's ghost!

The universality of religion, as a human phenomenon, needs

a deeper and more coherent explanation than Herbert Spencer's Ghost Theory. The most effective refutation of error is the lucid statement of truth. What *is* the true explanation of this universal phenomenon, religion?

Flung into life and face to face with its realities, the first question of rational beings is, *Whence?* There is a tendency to seek an answer, and the first answer is in the terms of personality, I was made by a being like myself, but greater. To a child the first explanation is a personal one. His motion originates from volition, and so he thinks all motion does. If any thing happens, somebody willed it to happen. If he sees means adapted to ends, somebody adapted them. That is all, and it satisfies his mind. The reason within him implies a reason before him, around him, above him. He is in an intelligible world, endowed with motion, and he refers it to an intelligent being who possesses will. This is usually called anthropomorphism. I prefer to call it the psychotheistic tendency, or the tendency of the soul to seek God.

Among the early peoples of the world, with untrained intellects, the co-ordinating power of the mind was small. The psychotheistic tendency had play, however, and the result was

> "The intelligible forms of ancient poets,
> The fair humanities of old religion,
> The power, the beauty and the majesty
> That had their haunts in dale or piny mountain,
> Or forest by slow stream, or pebbly spring."

That was the golden age of spontaneous poetry, when all nature was a grand temple. As the rocks of the earth contain the evidences of its age and history in the fossil remains sealed in their granite tombs; as the languages of the globe reveal in their radical affinities the relationship, development and migrations of man; so the myths of the archaic age that have floated down the stream of tradition from a prehistoric era, disclose the psychotheistic tendency operating in the primitive myth-makers. Philology shows traces of a primitive monotheism among the Aryan peoples, and tradition has retained it among the Semitic races. But the airs of fancy shattered the once unbroken stream of monotheistic belief into the spray of polytheistic in-

vention among the poetic peoples, until gods celestial, terrestrial and infernal were multiplied and became a mighty pantheon.

If we admit the inherent tendency, which I have named, to translate outer phenomena into the terms of personality, we have an adequate explanation of the origin, growth and diversification of religions. St. Paul, standing in the midst of Mars Hill at Athens, a believer in the One God that monotheistic Israel had worshiped before Homer sang of the fall of Troy, aye, that Abraham worshiped before the Hellenes parted from their Aryan kinsmen in the snow-capped Himalayas, St. Paul, standing here with the marble gods of Greece all about him, and Minerva's white form towering above him on the acropolis to the east, worn and soiled with toil and travel, St. Paul said to these men of Athens: "As I passed by and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you. God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshiped with men's hands, as though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he be not far from every one of us." (Acts 17 : 23, 27). Out of this apostle's lips comes the statement that God made men to seek him, if haply they might feel after him and find him. The psychotheistic tendency is real, God has implanted it that men might feel after him. In the African savage it finds only a vague consciousness of a personal presence as dark and cruel as his own soul. In Plato it finds an all-wise Reason that is likewise a perfect Goodness. In Paul it finds a Holy Presence "in whom we live and move and have our being." The religious consciousness exists in all, but the circumference of it depends upon the length of the radius that is swept out into the darkness to feel and to find. Every vessel

may fill itself in the sea, but it can hold no more than its own contents.

It is not incredible that men with a faculty for knowing the truth should fail to find it. Experience shows that most men do fail, in some particulars. It is not incredible that men with a double nature, a carnal and a spiritual, should often neglect the higher for the gratification of the lower. This also is a matter of experience. It is not strange, then, that men with the psychotheistic tendency should fail to find God, or blend their baser notions with the knowledge of him and remain in superstition. Paul realizes all this when he says, in that sad, mournful conditional sentence, full of pathos to all who realize its depth of meaning, "if haply they might feel after him and find him."

There are two questions in which theology has a living interest: Does the psychotheistic tendency, when earnestly followed, result in finding God? and, Has the modern cosmic conception introduced any elements that neutralize the result?

If man is to have any explanation of his existence, which his rational nature has always demanded and still demands, he must find it either by explaining the universe in terms of personality, or by explaining his own personality in impersonal terms. And let us remember here that evolution is not unfavorable to a personal explanation, because evolution is only a formal and not a causal theory. It tells *how*, but not *why*. It gives the *process*, but not the *cause*. In seeking the cause we may fairly fix upon the *highest* product of evolution and demand for this an adequate explanation. And, again, as there is advance from low to high modes of being in the line of evolution, it is fair to regard the cause as transcending the lowest form of being, or else the cause would not be adequate to the production of the highest. The cause may be for a time unmanifested in the effect, but it must exist latently or it could not be adequate for the highest and final effect. Evolution, therefore, involves the existence of a transcendent cause, to render the progress possible. Otherwise, the cause would be exhausted in the *first* effect and further development would not follow. The highest mode of being directly known to us is *personality*,—rational, self-determining in-

telligence. If there be a higher, and this is possible, it must still be conceived by us under this form. Nothing less than personality can explain personality. Nothing can be an explanation to me that is not in terms of my own nature. What I know directly in consciousness is thought, feeling and volition. To translate these into anything else is to substitute new thought for old, but it is thought still, or it is nothing intelligible. To say that thought is the result of matter or of force, is to say nothing, until the nature of matter or force is made plain to me, and then it has been translated into thought again. When matter and force have been explained to me, I find the explanation in the knowledge finally given. Abstract the knowledge, and you spoil the explanation. *Thought then is ultimate.* Matter and force are but phases of thought, so far as they mean any thing to me. They must be thought *by me* before they are an explanation, but when they are my thought the explanation is found in the *thought* about them, they do not explain the thought. I am a force working for rational ends. A force has produced the ends and me working toward them. There is no hope of explaining myself by a clash of atoms, for it would not be an explanation if it were not a *rational* clash; and if it be that, I care not for the *clash* but for the *rationality* that is in the clash and caused it. There is no hope of explaining my being as a fumbling of blind forces, for in producing me and in explaining me it has been a *rational* fumbling, and I care not then for the *fumbling* but for the *rationality* of it. *I* think; the *universe* thinks; it thought *before* me and thought *me*; in thinking me it thought *of* me; it still thinks and thinks *for* me; *I am its thought;* it *transcends* my thought; I aspire to think its thought and be directed by it. Personality, providence, prayer, all come back to me, and, in spite of evolution, nay *because* of evolution, I am religious.

Shall I say "it" and not "He?" Our ancestors said "He," all unsophisticated men say "He," reason says "He." Our Herbert Spencer attempts to define life, and describes a corpse. Our Professor Tyndall talks of the "promise and the potency of life" in a lifeless machine; a machine enormous in its proportions, measuring its miles by millions; eternal in duration, yet

not eternally a machine, but realizing its promise and potency of life in its grist of centuries; fatal as death, never swerving a hair's breadth from its predetermined movement; blind and purposeless as the inexorable slide of the avalanche; voiceless as the grave in its grim unbroken silence; dead as the mute mummy of a thousand centuries. Far clearer was the insight of our wild Scandinavian ancestors, who more than a thousand years ago, as Carlyle tells us, figured the universe under the image of a mighty tree. Igdrasil, the ash-tree of existence, said those barbarian thinkers, deep-rooted in the kingdom of Hela, spreading its wide boughs heaven-high, watched and watered by the three Fates, the Past, the Present and the Future, buds and blossoms with the generations; every branch a people, every leaf a life, the winds of the ages sweeping through its boughs with sad resounding music, its dry leaves ever falling, yet ever blooming with living fruit.

And men usually come back to this vital conception of the universe at last. Stuart Mill, who strove hard to realize an atheistic, or at least an "*atheous*," conception of being, in his last days, said, "In the present state of our knowledge, the adaptations in nature afford a large balance of probability in favor of creation by intelligence." Professor Tyndall in the preface to the last edition of his Belfast Address, extenuates the "materialistic atheism" advocated in the Address itself, on the ground that men have "their variations of mood and tense," and adds: "I have noticed during years of self-observation that it is not in hours of clearness and vigor that this doctrine commends itself to my mind; that in the presence of stronger and healthier thought it ever dissolves and disappears, as offering no solution of the mystery in which we dwell, and of which we form a part." Herbert Spencer in his late "Religious Retrospect and Prospect," says that when certain phenomena are observed by the physicist "the conception to which he tends is much less that of a universe of dead matter than that of a universe everywhere alive: alive, if not in the restricted sense, still in a general sense." And again, "Amid the mysteries which become the more mysterious the more they are thought about, there will remain the one absolute certainty, that he is ever in the

presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy, from which all things proceed." It is enough. The universe is alive and its life is an Infinite and Eternal Energy. The indictment against religion breaks down at last, the prosecution cannot sustain the charge that it is all a mere superstition, and before Reason's bar I may still worship and pray to the Infinite and Eternal Energy that fills and rules the living universe, and I shall choose to call Him the Living God.

And now, finally, what does the modern cosmic conception include that the ancient conception did not include that renders the result of the psychotheistic tendency illegitimate? Is it the *vastness* of the universe? This cannot appall a worshiper who can say, "Whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up to heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou are there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost part of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." Is it the *duration* of the world? What is this to one who says, "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day;" and "From everlasting to everlasting thou art God." Is it the *unity of nature?* Religion answers, "Know, therefore, this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; there is none else." Is it the *universal reign of law?* "The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations. Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." And thus we are reminded that religion has been repeating through the ages the very generalizations which science is represented as having lately discovered.

There has been an evolution of religion, but not such as the naturalistic Evolutionist represents. The true evolution is the divine response to the psychotheistic tendency. God is in the world reconciling the world unto himself. There has been a steady enlargement of spiritual capacity and a progressive apprehension of eternal truth. The history of man is made up of seeking, finding and formulating. The best evidence of religious progress is the fact that men feel to-day that the vessels of the past cannot hold the truth of the present. The world's

challenge to Christianity to vindicate its claims to the intellect and make room in its formulas for new truth, is resulting in widening our comprehension of what Christ taught and in giving it lodgment in the minds of men. More and more we are coming to see that to question is to learn, to doubt honestly is to believe finally, and that every lifting of the torch of intellect drives back the shadows of doubt from the treasures of faith and leaves them in a wider circle of illumination. A faith that cannot be harmonized with knowledge the honest thinker does not want, for faith that does not repose on knowledge is illusion. Whatever attracts attention to religion will ultimately bring men to realize the truth and value of it. Let us welcome, then, the deep questioning so characteristic of our time.

> "Let knowledge grow from more to more,
> And more of reverence in us dwell;
> That mind and soul according well,
> May make one music as before."

---

## ARTICLE III.

### HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY.

By Prof. W. H. Wynn, Ph. D., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

The inherent mystery of Christianity, as something not wholly indigenous to the planet on which we move, impresses itself immediately and profoundly on every thoughtful mind that will patiently follow the history of its rise and progress in the world. Eighteen centuries of varying fortune, it is true, but of unabated vigor and spiritual freshness, as on the Pentecostal morn, wherever it could have the least soil of susceptibility in which to take root, have carried it up to our doors, and we trust into our hearts, substantially unchanged from what it was when the Master first dispensed it from his hallowed lips and loving hands. Its history is its marvel. Not that other religions, Buddhism and Islamism for example, have not had an analagous career, persisting through long ages, and nurturing the spiritual life of millions of human beings; but we instinctively gather from the history of Christianity that it has within it a primordial element that the great ethnic religions do not possess.

We have fallen upon a time when the history of all religions is made accessible to us by the exhaustive researches of linguistic scholars, and others, to whom comparative mythology has opened up untrodden fields. The tendency of this line of study has been to throw up into greater prominence, and bolder relief, that extraordinary something that has always been claimed for the religion of Jesus. In the flush of discovery there has, no doubt, been here and there, a momentary rush into religious eclecticism, or free religion, or agnosticism, or some conceived philosophic or scientific residuum of all religions—an effort to take the good out of all religions and be partisan to none. Wherever this spell has fallen upon men, it has been favored by the imposing fact, revealed so overwhelmingly in our day, of the universality of the religious impulse. Religion is found wherever human beings exist. And so we have the new science of religion, which aims at discovering what it is in the nature of man that, among all races, and in all stages of social evolution, lifts him in devout frames toward the unseen and the good. If that thing could be noted, and drawn out distinctly before the mind, how natural to persuade oneself that it might be elaborated into a system, and men might go to deliberately practicing it in their lives.

And so the titillating dream of the Religion of Humanity arose. Institutional religion, it would have it, is this universal impulse taking on a ceremonial shape, dressing itself up in symbol, and sacred legend, and imposing ritual, and in its primitive stages insensibly blending with multifarious forms of superstition and the occult art. In this respect all religions run a parallel race. Christianity, being put down in the same category, has nothing else to show. Demonism and miracle come up with it in its far-back origin in the preaching of the Nazarene. Then, quite inevitably, under the shadow of the Roman Empire, whither it flies for refuge on the disastrous downfall of the Jewish nationality, it will shape itself after the all-dominating political model of the Mistress of the World. And so ecclesiasticism will arise, and priestcraft, and spiritual despotism, and all the revolting corruptions and impostures of the medi-

eval time, rendering the Protestant Reformation a timely interposition to save it from being entirely blotted out. Then the *aufklarung*, and whatever other period of successive illumination on this great subject, dropped down on us, and we began to see that for the wise men of our day the whole matter of Sacred Books, as authentic repositories of the early phases of any religion, should be subjected to the closest scientific scrutiny, and the most rigid sifting as to legendary details. Comparative philology was on hand for this task. A new school of criticism arose. The current swept on.

It was inevitable that some of the leading minds, absorbed in this line of research, should yield themselves to be drifted away from the old time conception of the religion of Jesus, into some purely naturalistic rendering of it, such as would filter it down into a qualified recognition of the religious impulse which is everywhere in the breast of man. And so the New Testament was put by on the same shelf with the Vedas, the Zendavesta, the Koran, and whatever other ancient sacred oracle would illustrate the paleontology of the religious sense. But something must take its place. On the one side the Religion of Humanity arose, with its ideal authropomorphic divinity in the surviving soul of the world; and on the other a Religion of Mystery, with incense burning night and day before the altar of the Great Unknown.

It is needless to say that these learned vagaries do not command the devotion of any considerable bodies of men, although, doubtless, multitudes are curiously watching from a distance to see what the daring innovation may do. They are somehow powerless before the perennial vitality of that which they would dispossess. My object is to find the historical secret of this overmastering energy, this undying vigor, in the religion of Jesus as the ages go by.

In addressing myself to a task that would seem to involve, in its announcement, nothing short of a review of the entire history of the Christian religion from the date of its rise on down through the centuries, I find that this is in great part rendered superfluous by a concession quite unanimously made on all hands, that, at all events, Christianity has developed a spirit of

"universalism" as they call it, a power of cosmopolitan adaptation, which the great ethnic religions do not display. This is the summary lesson of its history. The least familiarity with the successive epochs of its triumphal progress, from country to country, and from age to age, must bring that characteristic of it into vivid outline. It is at home among all peoples, and in every clime. It is preeminently not the religion of a race. The great ethnic religions, except as propagated by the sword, or in some way of contiguous communication, do not easily break over their indigenous limits, and are with difficulty transplanted to peoples of an alien blood. When so pushed beyond their congenial boundaries they inevitably die. In contrast with these, what we may call the traveling, absorbing, domiciliating genius of Christianity is a most marked feature in its history. It seems to take up its pilgrim's staff from the beginning for a tour of the world. The blood of all races is in its veins. It has no need of sword, nor diplomacy, nor empire; and the aggressive ambitions of men that carry on the wars are evermore in its way. Nevertheless it never gained a foothold that in after times it was compelled to give up. Taking its rise among a Semitic people it is still there; but it may almost be said to have started on its foreign journey on the Easter morn. It was a congenital impulse with it to "go into all the world;" its own plan with reference to itself when it organized its forces on the Galilean mount. Max Müller finds three missionary religions; there is but one. Any propagation beyond strictly national limits is only incidental with these others; with Christianity the purpose of universal evangelism, by aggressions and victories in which no carnal weapon should be used, was inherent in its birth. It was to organize at Jerusalem, and then start immediately for the subjugation of the world.

What is wonderful about it, and on the grounds of mere naturalism inexplicable, is, that this impulse to a world-wide propagandism should be a first principle with this religion at the moment of its birth. It seems almost a case of absolute beginning. The law of continuity, which is now made so inviolable in science, and which many of the learned expounders of Sociology are insisting should be equally inviolate in the

historical evolution of the race, seems in this instance to be quite set at naught. It is the solitary case of a religion embracing humanity at the first; starting with a conception of the human soul which, so far as its benefactions were concerned, must overleap all barriers of race and rank, and break down every partition wall. It was made the very condition of its coming, that before it all distinction between "Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman and freeman," should give way, and Christ come to be all, and in all.

This sudden burst of enthusiasm for humanity is the more remarkable as having its historical antecedents among such a race of people as the Jews. They were the most exclusive and intensely self-contained people in the world. For beneficent uses, no doubt, in the subsequent religious development of the race, this Semitic narrowness was made a safeguard for what was obviously a phenomenal depth and ardor of monotheistic conviction with which this strange people were endowed. Their one God was the one God of all the world. For long ages their theistic notions were immeasurably in advance of those of the surrounding nations, even when those nations were intellectually in advance of them. They had a genius for religion, as the Greeks had a genius for art. But the channel, running deep, was narrow and precipitous in the extreme. Such, indeed, is the contrast between the broad, free, universal, soul-loving aspect of the religion of Jesus, and the national exclusiveness and bigotry of the Jewish people, up to the last moment, that it is a spontaneous inference from the most exhaustive study of the history of those times, that Christianity was in some sense a new creation flashing athwart the centuries when all things were in readiness for its advent. It was a new creation in this, that it brought into the world what was not in the world before.

We can see, indeed, that this is assuming the point to be proved. That is exactly the aspect of Christianity which our new school of critics are intent on setting aside. They would see it growing out of Judaism, or the Prophetic and Pharisaic element of Judaism, as a branch from its parent stem, in accordance with just those laws of spiritual efflorescence which

we every where else observe. "In the course of the history of our race" says Kuenen "nothing comes into existence that does not link itself on what exists already; that does not—however new and unheard-of it may be—presuppose the existing state of things, and become impossible, even in imagination, when detached from it. As far as our knowledge reaches, the spiritual life of man, especially including religion, is likewise subject to this law. Are we to admit an exception in the case of the rise of Christianity? Unquestionably we must, if adequate grounds can be shown for doing so. But this is far from being the case."*

Now, of course, there is no reasonable conception of the religion of Jesus that would detach it from its historical presuppositions in the long cultus and spiritual life of the Jews. Christianity has its roots in Judaism; no one has ever thought of setting that aside. Jesus was born a Jew, and his rearing, following as it must the ineradicable pressure of environment, enveloped him in an atmosphere of Jewish sentiments and ideas. When he comes to set out on a new career for himself, it would be absurd to conceive of him as "cutting the thread of history behind him," and, both in matter and spirit, inventing everything anew. On the contrary it is distinctly claimed by the new creation theory, that Jesus begins his mission by absorbing all the essential truth of the past, and casting only the effete aside. He came not to destroy the law and the prophets but to fill them full. But when Ernest Renan asserts that "Christianity at its origin is no other than Judaism," we feel confident that he and his school have missed a deep-rooted element in it, which history thrusts intrusively upon our view.

Let history be the court of appeal. If it were the long line of Christian experience, in its main current, I mean, running in unbroken continuity from the day of Pentecost down to this present hour, remaining unchanged, essentially the one thing among all nations, and underneath every phase of ecclesiastical aberration, and every earthquake of social revolution, and every chameleon transformation of creed and polity, this were indeed history in one sense, and in a very strong collateral sense yielding the presumption in favor of the religion of Jesus as ordin-

*National Religions and Universal Religions, p. 201.

arily apprehended. But we are directly concerned with the history of the rise of this religion, as to whether in all its essential characteristics it is but Judaism revised, or whether what was in it, as it fell from the tongue and touch of the Master, could not have been easily and naturally evolved from what was in Judaism before it.

A broad and comprehensive familiarity with the religious life of the Jews, and particularly with the peculiar intermingling of conflicting elements in it, at the time when Jesus gathered up the straggling tissue in his hand, is necessary in any unbiased decision in a matter so grave. And here our indebtedness to specialists in historical and philological research is most promptly acknowledged. The vastness of their scholarly undertakings, and the wonderful discoveries they have made, impress us as something sublime; and we are well content in matters so stupendous and erudite to follow submissively in their lead. But nevertheless on coming to utilize these facts the judgment may go astray, or the generalizations may be radically at fault; or, at least, some advantage may be claimed over the specialist by one having the summed-up survey of the history of those times at an adjusted line of perspective. In any event there is nothing presumptuous in interrogating closely the conclusions to which they have arrived.

The one thing in which they agree is the universality of the religion of Jesus, as distinguished from every other most imposing religion known among men. Kuenen is at special pains to show that Islamism and Buddhism are essentially lacking in the elements of universal adaptation to the spiritual needs of the race; and that where they have conquered a wider territory than the ethnic limits in which they arose, it has been due to extraneous influences, and the accidents of circumstance involving in a very minor degree the inherent aptitudes of the religions themselves. Mohammed invented nothing, so that Islam may be described as "the kernel of Judaism transplanted to Arabian soil." The Koran does, indeed, explicitly propose a mission to all mankind, "a warning to all creatures," and the sword of the Prophet was ruthlessly unsheathed to carry this mission into effect. The rapid and bewildering successes of this

strange movement—the religious romance of the world—in the course of which the bulk of Asia, Egypt, the north of Africa, and a considerable portion of western Europe were lying at its feet; a movement which, but for the timely and swift tactics of Charles Martel, would have had the whole world east and west, from the Ganges to the Loire, as the theatre of its triumphs; which extends, to day, from Morocco to the Malay peninsula, and from Zanzibar to the Kirghis Horde, and embraces within its folds every variety of race-representative, Semites, Aryans, Tartars, Malays, and Negroes—all this is irresistible evidence of some sort of extraordinary energy in it, if it be not the kind we seek.

But when we come to contrast these conquests with the slow-moving, silent, unobtrusive, gradually transforming advances of the religion of Jesus, we find that the methods of propagandism, respectively, are not more widely divergent, than the inherent agencies that have supplied the weapons and determined the result. The very rapidity with which Mohammedanism sweeps over the world excites suspicion. There is not time enough for any deep spiritual struggle with conflicting principles, out of which only a thorough revolution in religious sentiment and feeling could be effected; and we know, now, that the very method of swift and violent vanquishment was resorted to under the consciousness of the lack of principles with the inherent power to do the work. It is probable that Mohammed's raid upon the world was not seriously contemplated until after the settlement at Medina, but notoriously then all the early enthusiasm of the Prophet and his company had declined, and thenceforth the enterprise was to be pushed by diplomacy and war. It resolved itself into "a bargain, sometimes struck, moreover, under pressure of violence and the instinct of self-preservation." "It was the prospect of plunder and conquest, a prospect that could only be realized if all the tribes united under one banner, that made them embrace Islam." The creed was, indeed, definite and simple enough to be caught up immediately by the most sluggish understanding, "One God and Mohammed his Prophet;" and bating the domestic feature of it, the ethics of the Koran were substantially those which the Jewish Scrip-

tures enforced. Despite all, Islam never replaced a single national religion it assailed. Its conquests were wholly on the outside, and underneath all the indigenous current of ethnic conception still ran on,—and still runs on, as is manifest in the Persian, Hindoo, and Japanese varieties of it, in which the discrepant ideas and usages of the native religions have never been completely absorbed. But we need not tarry here so long. Islam has not kept up with the progress of the world, notwithstanding the deserved eulogies of its American apologist, crediting it with many most valuable contributions to the intellectual development of Europe.*

A far more hopeful rival of the religion of Jesus, as regards this matter of "universalism," is Buddhism. Here is a wonderful power, a most impressive exhibition of human sympathy and self-sacrifice, coming out from its founder, and tending with pronounced impulse toward the universal race of mankind. Whether in legend or authentic story, the moral beauty of *Sakyamuni* is wrought into a picture of such surpassing glory, that many of the more sanguine minds of our contemporary time have imagined in him the Aryan conterpart of the Semitic Jesus, and have set about exalting him in stead. In the glamour of the early days of research into the history of this great religious reform in India six hundred years before the birth of our Lord, it was thought that all that Jesus came proposing to do for the salvation of the race had been antedated in that movement, and perhaps not less inextricably involved in superstition and myth. In its origin it "was simple, ethical, and rational, hence hostile to mythology, scholasticism, ceremonies, and priestcraft." "It called all men to the fold, without any distinction of quality or position, opening to all the way of salvation which it teaches to be attainable by purity of conduct." What more could Christianity do? If the disciples of Jesus went forth, in imitation of their Master, to promulgate his doctrine and establish his kingdom by a direct appeal to the understandings and consciences of men, none the less did Gautama and his followers do the same.

Indeed it is held that the element of authority, that is, the

*See Draper's Intellectual Development of Europe, chap. 16.

authority of the founder dominating the convictions of the disciple, is a less obtrusive feature in Buddhism than it is in the religion of Jesus; and so also the contrast between it and Mohammedanism, in this particular, is even more marked. Mohammedanism was *al Islamu*, that is, obedience to the precepts of the apostle; while the system of Sakyamuni was the "Way of the Four Truths," and these four truths were altogether moral and practical. Accordingly it turns out in actual history that this religion is preëminently a humane one, that there is no persecuting vein in it, as we are too often compelled to witness in the aggressive and retrogressive measures which have had Christianity in their charge. Have we not a religion here which has a very large element of "universalism" in it, and is entitled, at least, to stand side by side with the religion of Jesus, and share amicably with it the devout allegiance of men?

Those who urge this rely mainly on what they conceive to be the fundamental vital principle in all "universalism," namely, the ethical characteristic, the moral quality of the movement, quickened, of course, by the preëminent purity and self-sacrifice of the founder. Judged by this standard, what special claim can Christianity have over at least one of its great competitors to the wide sphere of humanity as its exclusive domain.

But maturer investigation has brought in a juster estimate of both the person and system of Sakyamuni. Viewed more narrowly Buddhism turns out to be a philosphical, rather than a religious, system, assuming the garb of religion in the intense asceticism in which it took its rise. It conserves the main religious *credenda* and cultus of Brahmanism, upon which it is a qualified reform. Its asceticism was Brahmanic. It was not, as has been so long represented, a reaction against the caste system, which had grown to such monstrous proportions in the India of the Brahmans.* In Ceylon, to-day, the strong-hold of Buddhism, the caste system prevails.† The very metaphysics of Buddhism, which, if anything, is the distinguishing attribute of it, as marking a most signal epoch in the development of the

*See Kuenen, p. 256, et seq.

†Dr. Oldenburg, as quoted by Kuenen, p. 262, 3, 4.

Hindoo people, is derived in almost consummate proportions from the philosophic speculations of the times preceding. Even that gloomy nihilism, that is so revolting to the western mind, had grown into distinct statement, before it was taken up by the Buddhist reformers, and under the title of Nirvana given a local habitation and a name.

Moreover "it is a system of monasticism, turning away from the world which it so much longs to save. And this feature of it is of no outside accretion. It does not fall in with the movement as by the accident of circumstance, after the manner in which Christianity was for long centuries both hampered and protected by it; it was inherent in its very life, an organic constituent with it at the hour of its birth. This of itself is a far-reaching disability. But we must add to this, that the legendary charm thrown around the name of Buddha, representing him as of matchless spiritual beauty, and regenerating India by the enveloping pathos of his overflowing compassion for suffering man, has been broken by the discovery that he was but one of many contemporary heads of ascetic unions, one of a host of professed "saviours of the world," who about the year 500 B. C. were springing up all over that caste-ridden land, and that only a series of accidental circumstances gave him a renown above his rivals, whom he did not excel either in profundity of thought or force of will.

Thus it would appear that the eager, and until recently, very sanguine assumption, that in the founder of Buddhism the deep, pervasive, all-clinging, never-relaxing personal energy of Christianity was transcended, must now be given up; and that the extravagant claims put forward for him by eccentric and poetical minds in our western world, must be tested, as we test all other similar claims, by the degree in which the man and his system keeps pace with the race. "Buddhism," says Kuenen, "has succeeded in taming barbarians, and still shows itself admirably calculated to assist in maintaining order and discipline; but has it ever supported a people in its endeavors after progress, in its recuperative efforts when smitten by disaster, in its struggle against despotism? No such instances are known." "Buddhism does not measure itself against this or that abuse,

does not further the development or reformation of society either directly or indirectly, for the very simple reason that it *turns away* from the world on principle."*

We are now in readiness to resume our search for that unquestioned something in the religion of Jesus, which gives it a rank of unapproachable superiority over every other, and which through long ages of travail and fruit-bearing among all nations, and in all climes, and amid every variety of social rest and unrest, has wrought out for it the well vindicated title of the "religion of mankind." What essentially is that characteristic of it which has, in such abundant measure, demonstrated its capacity to satisfy the spiritual needs of all classes of men that dwell on all the face of the earth?

As already hinted, here is a "universalism" that shows itself capable of an unlimited expansion, and an amplitude of human sympathy and adaptation which the ages do not exhaust, and which no barrier of race or civilization can withstand. Is this mere empty praise, the customary filial outpouring to the dear mother, Jerusalem, that gave us birth? Let us go back to the "origins," and see what, in all candor, we can discover there.

First, we may repeat with emphasis that the religion of Jesus, in its very inception, with its first breath of articulate self-assertion, consciously adjusts itself toward the human race as a whole, toward humanity as such, as distinctively its end and aim; and that it has so wrapped up this idea in the very life-tissue of its being, that without it the whole imposing structure must dissolve in mist. "And I, if I be lifted up will draw all men unto me"—lifted up, that is, by some sort of pathetic presentation of the ideal humanity to every far-off creature in which a trace of humanity abides. Humanity to humanity—that perhaps is the briefest summary of the Christian religion that we can put in words. It is not a conspicuous characteristic of this religion, a prominent, salient, all-dominating trait, even; it is this religion itself; and this way of representing it will indicate how infinitely far off it is, in its intrinsic spirit and aim, from any of the great groups of religions that share with it the populations of the world. And so, therefore, we suspect an element

*Ibid, p. 300.

in it, which does not wholly originate in the ordinary process of historical evolution, or which, in the last analysis, cannot be wholly traced up to a naturalistic source.

We must make this good. A kind of forestalling of the coming gospel was, indeed, the protracted privilege of the Jewish people. A class of men arose among them—the Prophets—who in paroxysims of high spiritual ecstasy were gifted with a most delicate faculty of discerning the eternal and abiding amidst the perishable and transitory, and so foretelling whither the providence of God was tending. These men were lifted above all the narrowing influences and perfunctory religiousness of their time, and flamed down with a Sinaitic anathema upon the national hypocrisy, and bigotry and exclusiveness, that ran in so deep and so foul a current through the whole spiritual life of the Jews. Their rapt utterances often break through the flood-gates of denunciation, and seem to sweep every limiting barrier away, as if the divine impatience had resolved at last to let out the imprisoned glory upon all the nations, and upon all the far-off waiting isles of the sea. The point to be noted is that the messages of these mighty reformers are uniformly of an ethical scope. They recall their sluggish fellow countrymen from a dull round of grudging ceremonial, to that kind of liberty which is the prerogative of all men, struggling against evil, all over the world. They are the fearless ministers of the law, as moral law, and as in a manner superseding the ceremonial prison-grinding into which their abject countrymen had fallen. They seem for the moment to have swept on strong pinion far out into the limitless empyrean, where there was room for a kingdom of heaven as ample as the brooding over-hanging canopy itself, a kingdom of heaven in the sense in which the great Messiah installed it among men. Now the question is, was Jesus only one of these? The last, and greatest, it might be, who succeeded in realizing the liberty his predecessors only foresaw, and who lifted the weightier matters of the law on such cherubim wings as would carry them into all the world?

Those who hold to this theory have found it powerfully reinforced, as they imagine, by the discovery of a like liberal strain

in the great teaching function of the nation, the *Sopherim*, the obnoxious Scribes and Pharisees, so directly antagonized by our Lord. These men stood for the law—for the *Thorah*—that is for the law, as righteousness, and for the law as ceremony with all that heavy burden of traditional punctilio with which they had hedged it round. The burden was too heavy. And so the argument runs, that inasmuch as for a large proportion of the people these exorbitant religious demands were utterly beyond their capacity to respond, there came to be an ever increasing body of outcasts right in the bosom of the chosen race. They were the riff-raff, the publicans and sinners, who because they could not carry the whole of the consecrated load, had lapsed into a settled obstinacy to carry none. By and by the wiser members of the *Sopherim* began to see that the exactions of their order were impracticable, and that, in this way, a formidable number of the elect people were practically put outside the pale.

It was therefore inevitable that the liberal spirits in these learned schools should cast about for some more ample rendering of the *Thorah*, that would relax its rigor and diminish its burden, and bring its requirements more nearly within the area of absolute moral law. Righteousness, simply as such, was that not enough for all men? And, indeed, could there be anything higher, anything better proposed? Where washings, and sacrifices, and fastings, and feastings, and all the long round of temple service, are not within the reach of the man, is it not the utmost that could be asked of him that he should give himself up to proximate attainments in supreme love to God, and disinterested love to the neighbor? This principle once adopted in order to take in the outcasts among the chosen people, to what extent will it be revolutionary of the theocratic idea that originally hemmed in the nation from profane intermingling with the pagan populations lying all around? But this intermingling had already begun in *Hellenism* on the one hand, and *proselytism* on the other, and so the driftings of Providence in a matter so important could hardly be misunderstood.

That there were forward minds in those days, of commanding influence in the schools of the Scribes, disposed to cherish pro-

foundly, and even advocate, these expansive views, cannot be doubted. Hillel was one of these. And it is to be inferred from certain remarks of Josephus,* that there was a pronounced ethical movement of this kind, right in the heart of that intensest center of national exclusiveness, the Scribes and Pharisees; and that, therefore, "universalism" in this sense was dawning all round the sky. Among these noted tithers of mint and anise, there were broad spirits that rebounded toward the universal brotherhood of man. Was Jesus only one of these? I know of no more decisive question pressing us in this day than just this one. If Jesus was only one of the *Sopherim*, with peculiar gifts, and a peerless power of personality to embody in his words and deeds the reformatory views otherwise simply intellectually conceived by here and there a great mind in advance of his age—if he was essentially only of the measure of these—then all our formally religious conceptions of him must pass away, and the worship of him must be set down as a prodigious mistake.

But this view rests upon assumptions which history will not sustain. For example it is all wrong to maintain, as this class of critics uniformly maintain, that the deepest and most prevailing element in the universality of any religion is the ethical element; or rather the degree in which all other elements are swallowed up and absorbed in this one.† To the question what entitles a religion to expand beyond national limits; or on what ground shall the student of religions feel himself justified in concluding concerning any one of them that it preëminently is the religion of the race—the answer would be, that only that religion is best adapted to the universal spiritual needs of mankind in which the ethical element is exalted to a place of unchallenged supremacy and power. But there is a lurking fal-

*See footnote in Kuenen, p. 234.

†Mr. Fiske, in the first of a series of articles on *The Idea of God*, apparently oblivious of any higher conception of Christianity, says that Jesus and Paul first set forth that idea "in such wise as to win assent from the common folk as well as philosophers, and to make its way into the hearts of all men. Its acceptance was hastened, and its hold upon mankind immeasurably strengthened by the divinely beautiful ethical teaching in which Jesus couched it."—*Atlantic Monthly*, Nov. No. 1885.

lacy in this. Righteousness, no doubt, is the ultimate test to which at last the relative merits of any religion must be subjected; and tried in this way Christianity, by the unanimous consent of all schools of investigators, is so far above the ethical drift of the age in which it originated, and is so unapproachably superior to its vaunted rivals in moral purity and beauty, that it has very naturally the appearance of rushing in upon men uncalled. It is as pure as its author, and in him we have a picture of ideal excellence which is, at least, the literary miracle of the times in which it was produced. Even so if we should regulate our estimate of the religion of Jesus by the depth and purity of its ethical element, we should be compelled to think upon it as some supernal irruption upon a broken and deteriorating order of things. But a characteristic of religion, however broad or deep, is not religion itself. And the effort to identify religion and morals—an intellectual experiment long and resolutely tried—has been so uniformly defeated by the finer spiritual perceptions of men, that now we may say it has been given up. History confutes it. The whole religious experience of mankind is against it.

We know that fundamental to all religion is its conception of God, and almost any competent historian, speaking without bias, would say that the glory of Judaism above the dark gropings of the outlying gentile world, consisted in its vivid realization of the one eternal, unchangeable God—*Yaweh*, the One who is forever to be. It is true that the superiority of the Jewish conception of God lies ultimately in the ethical elevation to which it was exalted. Yaweh was the Holy One, and he was inflexible in justice because he was holy. "Be ye holy, for I, Yaweh, am holy." We may go farther, and grant that the Jewish Yaweh was but the reflection, on the back-ground of the Infinite, of the ethical standard of the nation, disciplined and developed through centuries of peculiar and protracted struggle and history, all looking to this end. We may even accede to the general proposition that every highest and truest conception of God, in any age of the world, or among any people, is arrived at through an instinct or insight quickened and clarified by the protracted exercise of the moral sense. This would be

but accepting what we may call the *didactics* of the Master himself. But in all this we can discover nothing that would give the least countenance to the current project among the new school of critics and specialists, to reduce the religion of Jesus to what they are wont patronizingly to call "the matchless ethics of the Sermon on the Mount."

Religion is essentially much more than ethics; and the religion of Jesus, in an especial manner, brings to the human aspiration immeasurably more than could be set down in the most extended moral code. Particularly when our inquiry lies in the direction of the "universalism" of Christianity; when we are asking what it is in this religion that asserts for it the right of way among all peoples, and the precedence, through peaceful propagandism, of all other religions, even on their own national soil—in this case, preëminently, the ethical solution comes disappointingly short. We must assert that Christianity is a universal religion, because it is best adapted to the universal spiritual needs of men; but we could not set up that claim for it, if it were only distinguished by the exceptional beauty and excellence of its moral code, or even for the supreme moral elevation of its conception of God. There must be something more than this, though this would seem to be the very utmost that could originate in man.

It will be noted that all this ethical matter in religion is something we necessarily think of as originating in man, and directed toward God; all history reveals the fact—of stupendous moment in a discussion of this kind—that by far the deeper element in religion is a somewhat that men conceive of as originating in God, and directed toward men. There is always some sort of reciprocity involved; some interchange of feeling from man to God and from God to man. Of course, if it is all a groping on the part of the bewildered cravings of man, forever outward into an abyss from which there is no faintest echo of a response—as if a man were clutching hopelessly for the emptiness of the sky—then obviously, the theory of the natural evolution of all religions is the only one that has any foundation in fact; and that religion is farthest in advance which, like the materialistic theism of our time, deliberately recognizes the utter hope-

lessness of this devout clutching into the sky. In other words Christianity, and every other religion, is the pure product of historical evolution only on the assumption that all religions can be reduced to an ethical base. That, also, must rest on the foregoing assumption that the supernatural in all of them is wholly fictitious, the outside accretion of a superstitious husk. The religion of the religion does not lie in this, and, indeed, can only be found by eliminating this.

This famished, shriveled theory of religion is having a wide popularity in our day; and the line of argument made to do service for it is always over the well-beaten path of the absurdities of Christian theology, and the cruel wrongs and oppressions practiced in its name. Theology! dark superstitions! these are held to be quite synonymous terms. The ethical soul of Christianity is, no doubt, an august and imposing fact, but we have to pass through the long and bloody struggles of the centuries before we can arrive at its undisguised and untarnished glory, and then we shall see it with all the crude fortuities of theology dropped away, and a transcendent system of morals high enthroned.

All of this is quite poetical to contemplate, but misses the mark because of the crude notion of religion with which it starts. If the supernatural is a meretricious element in all religions, then clearly all discussion on this subject is foreclosed. On the contrary if the supernatural is inherent in the very conception of religion, and a broad and generous view of the depth of this impulse in human nature, as it appears in history, would predispose every earnest inquirer to reckon upon some hitherward movement from God, as well as some thitherward movement from man—then we must not shrink from the inference, that all religions on all the face of the earth have inhering in them an element of the divine. In any event this must be so; for we cannot conceive of men born into the world with a capacity for religion but doomed to be disappointed in its exercise by the very power that gave it birth. Religion is conceiving of God, but we cannot conceive of God at all without conceiving of him as making overtures to man, or, more philo-

sophically, as being in one everlasting attitude of overture toward the creatures he has made. And so, therefore, this movement in religion that we call supernatural is something that, in its bare fact and essence, cannot be claimed by one religion to the exclusion of every other. It is in some shape in all of them. In all of them the ethical or human element stands side by side with the supernatural or divine element, supplemental and coordinate; and without these two poles of all devout experience religion could not exist. In what respect, then, is the Christian religion superior to all others; what entitles it to be regarded as *par emenence* the religion of the race?

In answering this question we shall be obliged to use a term which has been so wantonly abused in its application to satirical purposes in the skeptical literature of the day, that, before we can feel entirely safe with it, we shall have to effect some sort of diremption upon it so as to get it congenially within our scheme of thought. It is *anthropomorphism.* This long cacophonous word has been used as a term of indiscriminate opprobrium upon all conceptions of God and all theological ideas that would indulge, in any way, in what is called fruitless diagraming upon the Infinite, or in any effort to crowd human limitations into the indiscoverable inane. "Out of the great deeps we came"—it is anthropomorphism to think of that abyss, circumfluent round all worlds, as conforming in any manner to the limited measures of the human mind; of God as sitting enthroned there; or otherwise coming down on a visit to our little planet, a bare speck amid countless myriads of worlds, where, as everywhere else, he must be always, or not be at all. It is anthropomorphism, that is, ascribing human infirmities to God, to imagine him inflamed with the jealousies and indignations of an offended majesty, when some obstinate subject of his, or apostate race, will wantonly trample on his imperial decrees, which also are promulgated after the manner of the arbitrary will of kings; and then, through the conflicting emotion of pity, to allow himself to be placated in a case in which his decree was announced to be as inflexible as himself; to have a deputy on earth into whose hands is committed, in his absence, the power to cancel or retain men's sins, to open or shut upon them the

everlasting doors! It is easy to see how this large word will conjure the superstitions and crudities of Mediæval theology, and the ignorance and oppressions and cruelties of the Christian Church tossing in the tempest of European politics and sharing the confusions of the unsettled civilizations of the West.

But there is always more meant than meets the ear by those who have appropriated this term to an exclusive critical use. They mean that it shall stigmatize not only the crudities of Mediæval theology, and the gross notions that are now and always current among Christian people who do not think, but, also, by implication, they attach the same label to every distinctive feature of Christianity which is outside of the ethical circumvallation they have thrown up around it. The incarnation, miracle, the resurrection, Holy Spirit, atonement—all this professing to be a manifestation of the divine feeling out of the invisible world, and presupposing a direct impinging upon the visible world of men and things by a process above the ordinary ongoing of natural law, is anthropomorphism, and is henceforth in our enlightened age to be pitied and condemned. And yet it is exactly this word that furnishes us the key to the transcendent superiority, and divine energy, and universal adaptability, of the religion of Jesus.

All religions are anthropomorphic; and must be, or they could in no way represent the religious aspirations of the race, or, coming to the human soul from without, awaken within it the faintest response. Even the progressive non-Christian minds of our age are beginning to feel this. The worship of the Unknowable, seriously proposed by certain enthusiastic apostles of Agnosticism, was found to be so repellent to the ordinary heart of man, so thoroughly intangible and empty, that there sprang up right over it and pressing it out, what bears the ephemeral title of the Religion of Humanity, supplying some mystical perduring image of the race as the object, all-brooding and maternal, to which the devout services of the individual are due. In a recent controversy between the apostles, respectively, of the two new forms of religion that are contesting the field supposed to be vacated by the religion of Jesus, the principle we are now advocating is thus strongly stated by the brilliant cham-

pion of the Religion of Humanity: "How strange is this new cry, sprung up in our own generation, that religion is dishonored by being anthropomorphic! Fetichism, Polytheism, Confucianism, Mediæval Christianity, and Bible Puritanism, have all been intensely anthropomorphic, and all owe their strength and dominion to that fact. You can have no religion without kinship, sympathy, relation of some kind between the believer, worshiper, servant, and the object of his belief, veneration, and service."* This is a timely rebuke, and yet it does not appear that the author of it had well considered the far-reaching scope of the principle he announced. Let us inquire briefly what it has to do with the religion of Jesus, in determining its relative rank with reference to all other religions of the world.

Christianity is not only anthropomorphic like the rest, but the specific and anomalous element about it, not heralded by prophets, not found at all in the schools of the *Sopherim*, unless in the way of dim adumbration in the Messianic hope, is the exalted type of anthropomorphism with which it addresses itself to men. It is the Religion of Humanity in the highest sense of the term. Its founder seemed consciously to be putting before the world not only an exhibition of the ideal essence of humanity, calling himself, by way of preference it would seem, Son of Man, that is, as the original imports, preëminently *The Man*, but making himself an organic something, a divine humanity, which should be the luminous center toward which the Godward aspirations of men in all ages, and in all lands, should constantly revert for help. In the religion of Jesus the personality of the founder is not simply accessory or tributary to its high mission; it is that mission; it exhausts it; without it not a fragment of that mission would be left. Jesus came proposing himself, and only everything else in the way of spiritual good on condition of this. His words are, indeed, fraught with a wisdom much larger and much simpler than is found in the sublimest utterances of the loftiest sages and deepest philosophers the world has yet known; and they were impressively illustrated by miracle on the one hand, and on the other by the

*Frederick Harrison's article on "The Ghost of Religion," in the May No. of the *Eclectic*, 1885.

transcendent miracle of an absolutely perfect life—but uttered wisdom was but the echo of the infinite personality lying behind.

The marvel is that the founder himself so represents it. It is not one of the subsequent theological constructions put upon it, and needing the help of a very ambiguous piece-meal exegetics, although, indeed, it must be confessed that for long years it was very blunderingly apprehended as having a subordinate place in our doctrinal schemes, and is coming down now much like a discovery upon the Christian thinking of our age—yet there it is, lying all over the face of those wonderful memoirs, and running through and through them to their utmost depth. Jesus proposes himself, not as leader or prophet, as Mohammed did, but as answering all the Godward impulses of the human soul. It is as if all he proposed to do for the human race were verbally condensed in the memorable words of John: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only Begotten who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath revealed him;" or those other deeper words of his own: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me."

Dr. Neander—a converted Jew, who was able, by the very transition in sentiment he was obliged to make, to grasp more profoundly than others this unique feature of the religion of Jesus—embodies it all in his favorite phraseology, "image of the divine life." Jesus was the image of the divine life among men. He came setting himself up, so to speak, in the disk of the Infinite, so that when men looked that way their vision might not be dazed. It was, of course, vastly more than a picture that he came to portray—it would be no religion at all that would configure itself exclusively for an aesthetic effect. It is God's feeling, or more properly the divine humanity, immanent in all minds, and to which all minds all over the world instinctively make appeal when struggling against evil, and reaching forward to a higher estate,—it is God's feeling concreting itself in human flesh and blood, and dropping out from the eternities right before our blindest eyes. Love and sacrifice go with it, and these are made to stream upward the more gloriously through the darkest tragedy our sin-cursed planet has ever witnessed.

Yet always it is the divine-human figure thrusting itself pathetically to the view.

In running over the life of our Lord it is noticeable—and this is the point with which we feel ourselves most powerfully impressed—that nowhere in this anomalous movement is anything said or done through egotism or for histrionic effect; and the case is obviously such that, on the supposition of the supernatural impact being dropped out, everything must go down under a weight of presumption absolutely unheard of before in the world. Jesus solicits all mankind to the continuous and habitual relinquishment of self to him; and, then, out of this shall come more and more the light which is incandescent in his word. It is the divine image everywhere, preceding everything, absorbing everything, pervading everything, pouring the mild radiance of eternity over everything, and exalting everything religious to a plane to which there was no ascending threshold in the history of the race. This is our earliest and latest impression of the religion of Jesus. The way-worn, miracle-dispensing, thorn-crowned figure is always before us, but glorified and kindled by the light that streams hitherward from the unvisited precincts beyond the tomb.

That this picture is not the mere theologic conjuring of our scholastic years, let any one recall how the story first stole in upon his boyish mind. The æsthetic dreams of romanticism during the Middle Ages will teach the same thing, painting, music, and statuary, all dominated by the same, sorrow-crowned, divine image. The Child upon its mother's bosom, an aureole of glory round her head by virtue of the embodied innocence committed to her charge; the marvel of the growing child; the realism of the mature figure moving with such ease among the transcendent glories of miracle; the wayfarer eagerly reaching out a rescuing hand to the most forlorn victim of sin and disease that gropes in our nether gloom; the transfiguration on the mount, in which that figure for one brief moment doffs its pilgrim habit and becomes diaphanous to the splendors of the eternal world; and then on to the wild storm of human passion that sweeps the unoffending One into the shuddering darkness of the crucifixion—the tragic eclipse of a broken world; then

that figure, thought to be dead, and laid away in the imprisoning shadows, rising again, and floating in the ether, calm, glorious, whole, and fresh as the redolent flowers in the garden of Joseph—all this with the added sentiment, that the clemency of pardon and the renewal of spiritual life drop in unstinted munificence from this glorified image upon all who, through tribulation, go up with it—after this manner the divine-human story fell upon our childish mind, and the long interval of scholastic jargoning and the theologic battling of the sects have abated no whit from "the visionary gleam."

It is true we are beginning to see that Gœthe's noted summary of it as the evangel of "Divine sorrow," is not as full and comprehensive as on first flush we thought it to be, since it limits Christian anthropomorphism to the suffering phase of it, the most human and tangible phase of it, no doubt, and appealing most powerfully to the untutored religious sensibilities of the race, and, therefore, the foremost, and as we may call it, the executive ingredient in the "universalism" of the religion of Jesus. The sufferings of the Son of Man touch at once the sympathies of the hardest heart. Especially as all the fiendish passions of men are seen to roll over against him, and break in harmless foaming at his feet. His sublime heroism, and the majesty of his resignation when all the world were jeering at him on the cross, beckon us from the distance, and we hasten to Golgotha to place on his bleeding temples a martyr's crown.

But there is something vastly more than this in it. Jesus himself gave the largest interpretation to his sufferings, when after the resurrection, on his way to Emmaus, he explained to his inconsolable companions how all the hard and cruel things he endured were but tributary and instrumental to the glory upon which he had entered. And this, also, was the burden of those last memorable discourses he delivered to his disciples in the upper chamber, when partaking with them for the last time the Paschal feast. It was expedient for them that he should go away, that he might come again; and now having gone away, he is come again forevermore. Somehow, in a way we do not yet fully understand this last state, the goal of his incarnate sojourn, the state of glory upon which he entered with the Father

after the resurrection, and in the ineffable sources of which he had his habitation before the world was—this last state was evolved in suffering; and so the Apostle has exactly expressed it when he says: "It behooved Him * * to be made perfect by sufferings." No doubt this state of glory is infinitely more than can be embodied in the luminous figure that the mystic conceives as hanging forever on the horizon of his soul, but that much at all events it is; and so we have the very culmination of Christian anthropomorphism in this ever present image of the glorified Son of Man. That also is what is meant by the reign of the Spirit. It is the ubiquity of the divine image working everywhere in the minds of men, upon the basis of the most fragmentary knowledge of Him whose glorified person it really represents. Theology may not have always so apprehended it; Christian experience has.

It was inevitable from the very beginning that Jesus should be the God of the Christian; and in this far off day when many strong social and intellectual forces are combining to induce within us some notion of Him less deific, the honest, religiously impressible mind can admit of no such alternative. It is the uniform effect of these few brief memoirs we have of Him, and whatever legendary corroboration may have lingered in the air, to make him not less than God, though figured in the intensest realism of a brother man. "Very God, and Very Man"—that is the unerasible imprint of his personality forever. It requires an amount of labored construction, and the most sinuous critical winding, to blur this image on its Godward side; and when the most brilliant feat of this kind has been achieved, every disinterested mind must turn away from it with the instinctive feeling that unwarranted violence has been done. The most insuperable obstacle in the way of such attenuated view of Jesus is in history. The deific imprint of his personality has made Christendom what it is; and the whole bulk of Christian theology, and the highest type of Christian experience, for now these eighteen hundred years, have taken their rise specifically from this source, and found in it the perennial enlargement of their power. The leading civilizations of the world have been cradled in this conception, and have grown up, and become

overshadowing, from the kind of spiritual nourishment it supplies.

But what we design insisting upon here is, that this God-man type of anthropomorphism is wholly peculiar to the religion of Jesus, and is so thoroughly unique among all the religious anthropomorphisms of the world as to compel the inference that it could not have been altogether historically evolved; that, as to the idealistic element of it, it is an advent from the invisible world—an incarnation, not an *avatar*, for all those oriental dreams of the gods coming down to walk with men, or the Buddha characters going up to the company of the gods, reveal in their very rehearsal the unmistakable atmosphere of myth.

The life of our Lord is not of this kind. It is set in such an indefeasible background of human realism and fact that myth is impossible; and the only systematic attempt at so absurd a reduction was reserved for the second quarter of our own century, and it was so obviously the result of preconceived theory and unfriendly bias, that after a brief storm of critical commotion it passed into forgetfulness, the distinguished originator of it himself drifting on at last into grossly materialistic views. As Dr. Neander so aptly replied, if the life of Jesus is built up of the legendary fret-work of the marvel loving fancies of men, as were the stories of Sigfried or Arthur, then the writings in which this life is recorded are the abiding literary puzzle of all time. There is no air of legend about them, though handling material like that with which legend and myth are constantly engaged; on the contrary they are the plain, simple, unemotional, unpoetic rehearsal of things heard and said, the infinite import of which the narrators evidently felt would be embarrassed, rather than helped, by any verbal skill which they might bring to their task.

But the time for solicitude from that quarter is past, and we are summoned to a new phase—new but very old—of opposition to the religion of Jesus, which would superannuate it in favor of some philosophico-religious view of the universe that would put back of it an all-comprehending impersonal force.

What use can we have of a religion at the center of which is an alleged divine person, whose avowed purpose it is to manifest and visibly demonstrate, so to speak, the supreme personality of that eternal power in which the universe lies? These philosophies rest upon a postulate that will admit of no such thing. It is fundamental with them that personality is in no sense whatever conceivable as inhering in what they consent to call the Power lying behind all phenomena, and perduring through all change. In thinking of that, anthropomorphism is the special fallacy to be shunned. By and by, when they begin to feel that the religious instinct is pressing, and that their speculations cannot evade the issues thereby created, and they turn to examine the principle of faith, which they find to be a large element even in scientific pursuits, and in the matter of religion the very heart and soul, they resort to the expedient, reluctantly and sadly as it seems to us, of setting up a religion of Mystery, in which the faith of the devotee shall have "center everywhere." Do this, exercise a faith that shall have its center everywhere, and you will escape anthropomorphism, and have a religion in which all alloy of superstition and imposture shall be purged away. But a new wonder here appears. The ordinary consciousness, the mind of the masses, and even the heart of the philosopher in whom yet the warm pulse-beats of human sympathy have not been intellectually chilled, cannot be satisfied with a religion so comminuted and dispersed, so aimlessly diffuse, so lost and absorbed into hopeless nihilism and night.

There can be no following for a religion of this kind. The experiment is an old one; oft repeated, and every time with disastrous defeat. Perhaps the best illustration of this is Buddhism itself. Here is a philosophical religion running off into atheism on the one side, and nihilism on the other, systematically crushing out and dissipating the spiritual convictions that lie at the heart of all religions—belief in God and the immortality of the soul—how could it yield a spark of comfort to the mind that originated it, and how could it ever win the devout allegiance of a single soul? Yet four hundred and fifty millions of human beings are worshipers at this shrine, against

four hundred millions that bow at the feet of the Nazarene. How is this?

The truth is, Buddha was deified, and the apotheosis immediately filled up for the popular mind all that abysmal emptiness which his speculative system had uncovered. When Buddha takes the place of God, it must follow that all the glow and beauty of self-sacrifice, and human sympathy, and lofty moral perfection, that legend had stored up in his name will supply the missing anthropomorphic link, in a way quite analogous to that in which the religion of Jesus commends itself to men. But in this case it is not any longer philosophy meting out to the religious needs of the soul, but the religious needs of the soul reasserting their claim right under the black shrine of a godless philosophy sweeping it all away. The same thing, in principle, applies to the successes which Mohammedanism has met in the world. Its bald, impersonal, ethical, characteristic could not commend it to the hearts and hopes of men; there must come in the *evali* or saint-worship, supplying again the missing anthropomorphic link.

All this makes it apparent that a religion of philosophy, however ethically elevated and pure, cannot meet the irrepressible cravings of the human soul for something divine, something human and divine, on which to stay its hopes, and from which to draw light and comfort in the darkness and bitterness of this present evil life. Agnosticism and the religion of Positivism are futile undertakings of this kind—attempts to replace religion with philosophy, or rather to make a religion out of philosophy by first tearing up the very essence of religion by the roots. Even Hegel's definition of religion as "philosophy warmed by emotion," is to be applauded only in so far as it appoints philosophy to a perpetual companionship with religion, but it falls short to the extent in which it fails to indicate the source whence this "warming by emotion" is to come. Philosophy is always facing the Infinite; Jesus stands as a divine-human figure forever in its foreground.

This last matter, however, it is for the most part difficult for philosophy to accept—difficult, because it hopes in its fatuity some time or other to conquer the impossible problem or com-

pliment itself on the magnanimity of its defeat. Yet this that is so hard to accept is historical Christianity, a species of anthropomorphism without which the religion of Jesus would cease to be, and with which it easily finds its way to all hearts and all homes, and dispenses its light and comfort to the uttermost bounds of the world, This thing, so difficult for philosophy, is always and essentially at the heart of religion; and in Christianity it is a historical verity toward which the legendary dreams of the groping nations, and the theophanies of the Jews, and the mythology of the Greeks, and all the devoutest longings of human nature everywhere, unerringly point, as the realizing substance of what were else a flitting shadow or a transitory gleam. The discomfiture of our philosophical religions recalls with new meaning the memorable words of the Apostle—the same to whom Jesus was "the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his substance"—describing Jesus as "the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation; for in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things were created by him and for him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist."

## ARTICLE IV.

### THE INTRODUCTION OF HUMAN LIFE INTO THE WORLD.

By Prof. S. C. Wells, Ph. D., Roanoke College, Salem, Va.

The earth bears upon its surface and hides in its chambers many of the secrets of its creation. Especially is this true of the varied lines of vegetable and animal life that have been introduced—have run their course and ceased to exist.

The history of the earth like that of man has had its periods. In both there is first a blank, behind which we cannot go. Next, the dim light of the gray dawn—the age of myths, when things real and unreal are mingled undistinguishably. Then the clear light of the true historic period, brightening to the meridian under which we stand.

Among all the events committed to the keeping of the earth,

none have had for man a profounder interest than his own origin. From the strata, deeply buried beneath our feet, we can bring up the remains of vegetable and animal life so beautifully and so perfectly preserved, that with little art we can restore the fauna and flora of vanished ages in all the likeliness of their first estate. We can see the plants of those old ages growing, fulfilling all the functions of their simple lives, then decaying, as are the flowers of the fields to-day. We can see animals, in many curious and monstrous forms, basking in the sunshine, swimming, flying, pursuing, feeding, dying. As we reproduce such scenes, the thought uppermost in the mind is, was man contemporary with those early lives? At what point of time, relative or absolute, did he come upon the stage? Did he take on him the burden of life in some crude and elementary form to grow gradually through long ages into what he now is; or did he enter from behind the scenes to play his part, invested, at the first, in all the dignity of his intellectual and moral nature? These are questions whose solution, if indeed science can give a solution, is pressed upon every intelligent mind. They are now opening a wide arena for scientific battle in which heavy blows are given and received.

We will try, as briefly and plainly as may be, to indicate the leading points in the discussion and to give such of the conclusions yet reached as seem to be clearly established.

The questions on which all the issues depend may be narrowed down to two:

1st. At what time was man introduced?

2nd. In what condition of development?

Let us turn to the testimony that the earth gives touching these great questions. The stratified rock systems, through their whole extent, are full of the fossil remains of vegetable and animal life. These begin at the first of those rocks that rest upon the granites, rocks whose antiquity must be measured by millions of years, of rock making that went on then at no more rapid rate than it is now doing. In these bottom rocks we search in vain for any trace of man. For as in the earlier of the old Genetic days, which these may be, the earth brought forth only herbs and grass. These were delicate and perisha-

ble, and it is wonderful that their traces have been so well preserved. The presence of graphite and iron ore in the same formations, affords presumptive evidence of yet earlier vegetation whose patterns have been forever lost. Closely upon these come shell fish and corals in great variety and in numbers of which the present seas can give us no idea. But as we come up from the bottom of the scale in pursuit of truth, upwards toward the surface through a thickness of strata fairly representing hundreds of thousands of years, we note a great and striking change. We have reached the Devonian rocks, whose dark rounded backs are exposed in many localities. Here was introduced, for the first time, that sub-kingdom of animals to which man belongs—the vertebrates. They entered as fishes. We have the evidence that they came in suddenly and in countless numbers, and that all the early seas swarmed with them. As we look wonderingly on the traces of their forms crowded in all the strata of this age we can, by the ear of faith, reverently hear Moses by inspiration saying, "And God said, let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life." But though thousands of curious forms are around, preserved in even their most delicate parts, there is, nowhere, any trace of man. The dawn of his life, who is the crown of all God's works, is yet deferred.

Ages come and go. Æons roll their uncounted years over creation. Another great leaf is turned, revealing the carboniferous period in which the greatest of the world's coal measures were laid down. There is much change. More land has risen above the waters and larger forests clothe the ground. The general flora is the most splendid and extensive of any which has become extinct. Animal life is amphibian. Gigantic forms, in transition between land and water animals, abound. The record of this age is well preserved. Even the patterings of rain drops on the soft shores, which have since hardened into rocks, survive. But we yet search in vain for the memorials of man. In the splendid herbariums and museums of the coal rocks, he, too, would be preserved in perfection of detail. His absence is certain proof that God had not formed man in his own image.

Another step is taken upwards in our quest for the testimony

of the rocks. Another leaf is turned. The age known to geologists as the Mesozoic comes in. It differs widely in its turn from the carboniferous which has gone out. It has been called by emphasis the age of reptiles. The creative forces were here in excess producing the strangest and most gigantic forms that the earth, in all its history, has ever witnessed. Saurians, iguanodons and pterodactyls dominated sea, land and air, spreading confusion and terror around. Many of these have been disentombed from their rocky vaults and restored by scientists into their original form.

They are wonderful in brute development and intense in savagery. But in these cemeteries of forms long since, happily, extinct, there is yet no trace of the bones of man—nothing to suggest that he had any part in the drama of life then played.

Amid the further elevation of mountains and the consequent advancing geological changes in the direction of world making, the scene again shifts. At the introduction of the Cenozoic era, we are startled by the strange likeness of its life remains with those now existing. Here modern geological history begins. Since the last era there has been an immense advance in life. The great land mammalians come upon the stage in all the pomp of their splendid forms, closely allied, in all save size, with the mammals of our own day. The present aspect of field and forest begins. Indeed every thing begins to indicate that the very long period during which life has been created and introduced, especially in alien forms, is nearing its close, and the dawn of the present and more familiar order of things is growing gray on its eastern horizon. But the dawn in its fulness does not appear.

It is customary to divide this era into two periods—the tertiary and quaternary. The tertiary and older has well marked characteristics. It is represented, in general, by the tidewater portions of the continents and by interior and isolated areas, the former being referred to marine, the latter to lacustrine deposits from the debris of older and exposed strata lying adjacent. From the nature of its deposition, from the localities which have been so covered, as well as from the marvelous advancement in life system, it is found, as was to be expected, rich in the in-

volvements of animal life, many of which are scarcely distinguishable from living species. Here begins the contest over man's bones, the tertiary man figuring prominently in all the earlier discussions of our origin. But careful examinations of the circumstances under which he has been found, or supposed to be found, have made him a myth. His existence here has been, consequently, abandoned by the most reluctant of scientists.

The advent of the quaternary period was marked by the widespread operation of ice and water as geological agencies. By these, drift, gravel, sand were transported over great distances and spread with desolating effect over the earth. Otherwise the face of nature, in expression and feature, scarcely differed from that which it wears to day. Trees and flowers were the same, fishes and shell fishes the same. The land animals were, in great part, genera and species, the progenitors of the land animals of to-day, except that the huge leviathans that then shook the earth with their tread, have but recently disappeared. In this quatenary period, upon the earth so fashioned into its modern aspects man mysteriously appears. His remains are found first in gravel beds and caves, notably in England and France, under peat and moss marshes as in Ireland and Denmark, and in the Swiss lakes, above whose waters he lived, very anciently, in rude huts built upon piles as a protection against the wild animals he had not yet subdued. His record is often but the rude flint implements of the chase and of his narrow domestic life. The bones of mastodon, elephant, bear, lion, and hyena, his cotemporaries, lie around buried in the same common deposits.

If, then, we find traces of the existence of man first in the quaternary, to which a thousand lines traced on all the continents converge; we have the *relative* date of his creation.

The great fact stands out palpably and unmistakably in nature as in Moses that man was formed last in the order of time. To determine the *absolute* date is another and more difficult problem. In the sunshine the gnomon of the dial casts a dark shadow which moves daily from west to east. But its motions and positions have no significance as time keepers, unless the

circle of the hours be engraved, in order, beneath. The moon is a clock in the sky and a determiner of longitudes, whereby time and place may be known, but only when her positions with respect to the stars that lie in her pathway are predetermined. So it is in reference to the quaternary period. There is need of something to link it with the historic period, however dimly that something may be discerned. Otherwise, though man evidently belongs, as to his origin to this, he may still be conceived as stretching back into the hoary past, very far beyond the limits of any biblical or profane chronology. Indeed, this is just the view taken by evolutionists. The widening and deepening of certain valleys, for instance that of the Somme in northern France, as indicated by the position of river gravel under which the remains of man have been found, leads Sir Chas. Lyell to believe that if the forces affecting the face of the country have not been more active in the past than they now are, the origin of man must be put back about 800,000 years. Though this eminent scientist for reasons satisfactory to himself has since thrown off 60,000 years, there is still a very large remainder left to disturb chronologies. It may be remarked that the evolutionary geologist is very rash and reckless in his expenditures of time. He is a very spendthrift feeling that, in the past at least, he has a fund of time upon which to draw without fears of its exhaustion. The same scientist and also Sir Jno. Lubbock think, from examinations of remains deeply buried under the silt at Natchez and since known in science as the "Natchez man," that North America was peopled more than 100,000 years ago. Dr. Dowler estimates that the skeleton of a red Indian found by him whilst making excavations in New Orleans at the depth of fifteen feet was 5,760 years old, and these figures have been accepted by Nott and Gliddon in their work on the "Types of Mankind."

In the midst of these wild estimates and of the consequent uncertainty thrown by them on the questions involved, it is pleasant in the interest of truer science to know that a clew has been found, which has been well followed up notably by Dr. Southall, of Richmond, and by Dr. Andrews, of Chicago. This

is the record, in time, which the great "ice age" has left of itself. To explain; the quaternary itself has been divided into three well marked subordinate periods—the glacial, during which the northern parts of North America were covered with a sheet of ice as far down as the latitude of New York, and in Europe the whole of Scandinavia, Scotland and north of England. Secondly, the Champlain period during which, by a supposed subsidence of the land causing much of it to be overflowed and of the consequent introduction of a warmer climate, the great northern ice sheet was melted, making this a time of floods and of the deposit of that river gravel under which so many of the remains of man have been found. Thirdly, the terrace period which was an uprising of land from its previous depression forming the terraces which so often border our rivers and surround the great lakes—which are known generally by the unscientific but popular names of first, second and third "bottoms" when applied to river lands. This was the last great movement which left the earth in its present form.

Again, archaeologists divide the duration of the life of our race on earth into ages—1st the old stone age, in which man used the rudest and simplest stone tools and utensils—2nd the polished stone age—3d the bronze or copper, and lastly the iron age.

In the application of these subdivisions to the case in hand, it is to be remarked that we find no memorials of old-stone-age man in the north of Europe, *i. e.* Sweden, Norway, Scotland, Ireland and the northern part of England. Nor do we find here any traces of mastodon, rhinoceros, bear, or lion, the usual fellow sleepers with ancient man in his places of sepulture. These are most interesting facts as they show that man and the great mammals in their migrations were prevented from penetrating these regions by the presence of the ice sheet of the glacial age. The earliest traces of him found north are in the carses of Scotland and in the Danish and Irish peat bogs, but the implements found with his remains there, are all of the polished stone age. We are thus able to synchronize the end of the glacial age in northern Europe with the introduction of polished stone (neolithic) man in those regions. Now archae-

ologists have, by their own peculiar methods, agreed with much unanimity, on about six thousand years as the date of the neolithic. Hence the glacial age comes down from a supposed unknown antiquity to a comparatively recent time. Again man, accompanied by ancient stone implements (palaeolithic) has been found in great numbers in the Somme Valley in France Hence the difference in time between his appearance in France and in northern Europe, marks the duration of the earliest stone age and also that of the glacial age itself, in northern Europe.

It is from such considerations, whose leading steps only we are able here to indicate, that scientists have been able to bring down the date of the glacial age, with which man's appearance and settlement in Europe seems to be involved, to an antiquity not greater than a few thousand years.

But in all Europe man seems to have been an emigrant from an Asiatic home. There the date of his origin has been determined with a great degree of certainty at an era less than 9000 years from our own.

Again by ingenious and painstaking calculations on the remarkable terraces around the southern end of Lake Michigan and the bluffs on its western side, caused by the wearing of the shores by waves and the transportation and massing of this material, Dr. Andrews has been able to estimate the date of the end of the glacial in North America at 5500 years ago. This is an independent result, but it agrees remarkably with that of Europe.

This lowering of the date of man's introduction both into Europe and North America, is in strong contrast, as a scientific determination with Dr. Dowler's and Sir C. Lyell's Indian of 50,000 years. These scientists, however, based their calculations on a rate at which the Mississippi delta seems to be filling up, no estimate being made for the effects of special and violent floods massing earth suddenly upon special localities. As a matter of fact other excavations, near where this interesting Indian was found and at nearly the same depth, brought up the remains of a Kentucky flat-boat for which no hoary antiquity has ever been claimed. Again, advocates for a very remote origin of our race, have founded an argument on the alleged fact

that the animals which have been found so persistently with man's remains have long since become extinct, being succeeded by new species which have required ages for their development. There is a great deal of fallacy in this too. Comparative anatomists have shown that the cave lion, bear and hyena are identical with those now living. Early European literature makes mention of animals as prevalent which are now confined to the tropics. The hairy elephants exhumed on the coast of Siberia still retain about thirty per cent. of animal matter. They have had, it is true, the benefit of that great natural refrigerator, but must still have disappeared at no very remote date. In a Danish mound a piece of mammoth tusk has been found on which primitive man had made a spirited engraving of the animal itself, possibly its owner. Also in Grant County, Wisconsin, there is a mound, an ancient Indian work about one hundred and sixty feet long, thrown up and fashioned so artistically into the figure of this animal that it has been called since the date of its discovery the elephant mound. The presumption is that the artist must have worked with a living model in sight. Moreover we have, ourselves, seen the bones of the mastodon exhumed near Roanoke, Virginia, at a depth no greater than two or three feet.

We are now ready for the second vital question in the discussion: Under what circumstances was man introduced?

But two principal theories have been here entertained. Either that from crude beginnings or simple cells or protoplasm, created by the Divine power, or the accidental clash of atoms, he has passed through the chain of life from lower to still higher forms. That in this ascent he has been a "survival of the fittest," a much differentiated remainder, a collection of inherited instincts, until at some period in the past, he branched off from a common form and grew gradually into man. The other branches became the other members of the animal kingdom, thereby related to man by a common though remote ancestry.

The other theory is, that he was made last in the order of time, at no very remote period, comparatively, and that he was endowed in the beginning with all his physical, mental and moral powers in fullest exercise.

In reference to the first of these theories, it may be said that whilst it is in the line of many observed analogies, and might still leave man the subject of God's creative power, it is open to three great objections. In the first place, an enormously greater time is required for the chain of evolutionary changes whose terminal links are a cell on one end and man on the other, than seems to have been consumed or even required for the cotemporaneous work also carried on the meanwhile. The skull and other bones of very primitive man have been found, and we also catch a glimpse of him and of familiar animals as pictured on Egyptian pyramids and in the Valley of the Euphrates. During the five or six thousand years that have passed since he was thus entombed and thus sketched, he has undergone no observable change. The African races painted on the pyramids are said to be exact types of the African of to-day. Now, if so many thousands of years of life, under the most favorable circumstances, with the bounding pulse and the high exercise of developed physical and intellectual manhood have wrought no perceptible change, how many cycles of æons, to say nothing of years, would be required for him to come up from the cold, sluggish, hindered beginning assumed for him in this theory?

Again, if man grew up by stages to his finished state, he would doubtless leave at some points along his lengthened track traces of his changing forms. In one era, period, age, he must, necessarily, be different from that which he was in the preceding one. Now the earth preserves well that which has been committed to its keeping. As far back as in the old Silurian rocks, untold ages before man's advent has been claimed, we find the borings of worms in the sandstone rocks, and the delicate thread-like impressions of the graptolite. In the carboniferous the fronds of the fern are as perfect, even in their venation as in the same graceful forms now nodding in the breeze. In the mesozoic are seen the foot-prints of the insects of a day and the impressions of falling rain drops. At some point in man's wonderful evolution, say, when he was a very brute, or less a brute, or when he was half man and half brute, some connecting link should be found between what he has been and now is. But nothing the most faintly suggestive has ever been

found in the storehouse of the past beneath our feet. It does not meet the difficulty to say that these connecting links have been destroyed in the changes incident to the passage from one geologic age to another. For in America, at least, we have no evidence of great and destructive changes between many of the ages of world-making. Nor is it better to be told that such links *will* be found. Geologists are by no means an idle class. It is surprising to know how many of the genera, species, and varieties of every sub-kingdom of animal life have been found. No one can tell what may happen, but as far as the argument has been developed, the finding of the jury of the world must be "not proved."

Thirdly, the present Duke of Argyle has made an able argument to prove that the history of the world shows no tendency in man to rise in the scale of civilization by what is in man—that the tendency is rather to declension and degradation. It is no rebuttal of this that the cave dwellers and acorn eaters of early Greece became types of most splendid manhood and masters of all subsequent ages in literature, philosophy, and the fine arts. Cadmus brought letters and other civilizing influences into Greece from Egypt and the East. The same may be said of the Germans, Gauls, Goths, Saxons, builders of the nations of modern Europe. Conquered or conquerors they were raised from semi-barbarism by the power and influence of Rome. The naked cannibals of the South Sea islands have taken on the arts of civilized life; they have become industrious; they are church goers, even missionaries to such of their own race as still sit in darkness. But the light which has transformed them was not that which burned upon their own altars and in their own homes. It was the hallowed light which streams from the Cross, borne to them by the missionaries of that Cross. Scattered over all North America, the Isthmus, and northern South America are mounds, temples, and cities which have a strange interest for the antiquarian. It has been customary to refer these to races, called in the United States Mound Builders, in Mexico and Peru, the Aztecs. But the more thoroughly the questions involved are studied, the more clearly it appears that these Indians of an ancient and high civilization were the ancestors of our surviving

American Red Men. From so high a point have their posterity lapsed into barbarism even since the time when the foot of white man touched our shores. If then nations left to themselves decline, requiring for advancement light, stimulus and example from the outside—who were the first light bearers for the race if primal man came up from the brute?

The other theory is, that man was made in the image of God, in full possession of his intellectual and moral faculties. Examine the skulls of the earliest representatives of the race, whether from the caves of England or France—from the bottom of loess and till—from lake dwellings and river gravel—from cairns and mounds, wherever, indeed, from their place and surroundings they indicate the greatest age, the brain capacity of these skulls is twice as great as that of the animals which approach nearest to man. The facial angle by which our race is distinguished is also that of man in his average development. He has around him, it is true, rude stone implements. But these were used from necessity and are no measure of the advancement of his life. In Europe and in America he was an emigrant cut off from the base of supplies in the home of his race in Asia. For the same reasons the California gold seekers of '49 used rude wooden cradles to separate the golden grains from sand in the midst of the high coeval civilization of the 19th century.

If man was not so created it would be natural to expect that in such old centres of population as are those parts of Asia to which human history carries him far backwards, we should find his rudest beginnings; that there we should find the oldest of the stone implements which have been found in other portions of the world with his remains. But as a matter of fact—a deeply significant fact, we find no palæolithic man in Egypt or on the Euphrates. Man was, in those lands, at and around the primeval home of the human family, a worker in metals from the beginning. In the gray dawn of history he was a builder of pyramids and of cities. He founded great monarchies, Assyrian, Chaldaic, Egyptian; constructing roads, aqueducts, lakes, the wonder of even the modern world. On the very horizon of the dimmest history we see him in the pathway of imperial life, with traditions reaching farther backward still of a golden

age in which his race lived a nobler life from which he felt a conscious degeneracy.

Thus the lines of geology, especially, as also those of archæology and of comparative philology, as well, converge backwards to a point of time in the past at which human life was introduced into the world, but little more remote than that assigned by the current biblical chronology. This chronology is not of divine revelation, and will be extended as it should be, into still closer agreement to meet the demands of a more thorough study of Egyptian problems and of man's work in the lands still further to the eastward.

The same lines converge upon humanity in its first estate of perfect manhood with all its high and God given endowments to meet the wants of the origin of human life.

---

## ARTICLE V.

### MAN, OR MACHINE?

By Rev. Prof. M. H. Richards, A. M., Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.

But few persons think. Only the few rise habitually into the loftier realms of abstract thought and are at home among things intellectual; few induce the general law from the tangled mass of particulars; but few apply that law accurately to a new phenomenon and label it for what it is. Still fewer soar to a still higher sphere where spiritual fact and truth are the governing forces, and the plans and policies, the words and deeds arising from earthly conditions are examined under heavenly lenses, and searched for their qualities of absolute good, of eternal rightfulness, of divine sanction.

For the larger number the mysterious workshop of the brain is kept busy in turning out transient expediencies, articles for to-day's market, artisan work and not artist's. Such things as have a money's worth, such thinking as can be transmuted into bread and raiment, such taking of thought as is needed against the morrow, all this is the stock in trade, the familiar article of brain product of the many.

No one will deny the need of it or its usefulness. We are in the body, and must provide for it. We must eat, we must be clothed; we have animal wants and must provide for them by producing low-grade animal thinking. But no one will assert that this is the glory which distinguishes man from brute and raises him above them so that the heavenly light crowns his brow whilst their heads are in the earth's shadow.

This is perfunctionary, plodding, instinctive, machine work and no grand liberty. This is the turning of a crank and the evolution of the hand-organ, not the master mind and the masterful hands touching the keys until they sing the soul's song in new harmonies of creation. Not to create out of the God-given powers and the God-bestowed material, not to understand or sympathize with the primal forces still warm from the divine hand-touch, is not to think in any preëminent sense, but to act as does the machine, following copy, soulless.

To be a machine is not to be a man. The former is a contrivance for limited and specific purpose; the latter is the contriver, almost the creator, at least creative, as being the embodied breath of God. Man was not created to be a mere machine; to suppose so would insult his Creator. Man is very liable to degeneration into a mere machine; to deny this would be an insult to ordinary observation. We assume the freedom of choice that brings responsibility with it, and ask, which will you be, a man or a machine?

As a matter of fact, comparatively few men do ever think fully, deeply, broadly. A hundred explanations are ready at hand to confirm the suspicion. All the signs are very legible in their pursuits, their conversation, their popular literature, their recreations, their occupations, their legislation, their educational stand point, of a life which, as a rule, ignores much thought, and tolerates it only as an exception. High living, as has been said, not high thinking, is mankind's motto. A successful man is, in common parlance, not a successful thinker but a machine which has turned out many pennies' worth, or pocketed many turned out by other machines.

The fact is that real thought is possible only when the soul

is securely anchored by a living faith to heaven itself. To use a most modern figure, there must be an unconscious telephonic connection between the thinker on earth and the Thinker in heaven, over which messages are constantly passing and repassing. The grand thought is not absolutely an inspired thing like the divine word, but it is as near to it as anything can be which is not; it is the ever-approaching, never-touching curve.

So soon as men cease to question heaven and heed its answers, and how often they do cease, just so soon their best thinking is over, and the downward tendency asserts itself increasingly and disastrously. Then nations become immensely rich, and are ruined.

The spiritualized thought, the will and the ability to measure and catalogue human and earthly things by the divine standard, is the salt of the earth. The gourmand disdains so simple a seasoning as his only one, and yet without it his dish is unsavory. The worldling sneers at such a standard instead of his market value, and yet, when he has taught all men to spurn it, finds that in some way there is no market value left.

The exclusive man protests against efforts which tend to elevate the masses as unnatural and absurd, and yet the philanthropist and the Christian find that all their efforts to make men think, and be men, result not so much in any marked elevation as in retarding and arresting the progress of decline. The danger is not in having too many thinkers, but in having too few; the machines always will outnumber the men despite our best efforts. There is no danger of over-salting the world.

Now there is a thought minimum beyond which comes Niagara. All history proves this, and all individual human life illustrates it. It is a most serious call to every capable person to perform the duty of thinking as a matter of self-preservation and of patriotism. Society, church, and state cannot exist without this spiritual, intellectual salt. So soon as the finest and most capable elements forsake their high calling and turn into the channels of lower routine work in order to enhance themselves in creature comforts, then comes the beginning of the end.

What should have been nerves of touch and sight, the lower

intelligences and the meaner consciences, take their places and turn patriotism into partisanship, government into campaigning, and office into plunder. Like a fever raging more lustily where there is more to feed it, the more prosperous the people, the more outrageous is the spectacle of such a mismanagement.

In such a crisis the hewer and delver cannot save the people. They may feel their miseries most keenly, but they do not know the names, natures, or remedies; they have not been trained to think. The financier and the merchant, if that is all they are, are no more useful or able. They too can point to the disease, perhaps call it by its name, but as for a remedy are just as much at sea. Besides they are more likely to act as wreckers and coolly declare that they can make more out of the fluctuations of troublesome times, than in ordinary seasons.

Man decays first; wealth long afterwards, in such a ruin. Then, when manhood is gone, faith in God and love for our fellow have departed; then, as in a moment, the gigantic fabric of wealth with its bonds and mortgages, its stocks and its currency, melts away and becomes nothing. Its value was in the fidelity of law and of word to redeem a promise; withdraw that fidelity, and the promise is worthless; withdraw manhood, and that fidelity flees away; withdraw the thought vivified by heaven's electric current, and manhood is not.

The thinker, therefore, saves the state. If there is too little of him left to be effectual, then the state is not saved. Of course he saves the state exactly in the sense in which a general wins a victory. He vivifies and informs the masses, teaches them the neglected whys and wherefores, points out to them the way, the truth, the life. His fellow thinkers of lower grades, but still of his own kind, become his subordinate officers, and an army is formed whose weapon, public opinion, is irresistible. It is in this sense that the voice of the people is the voice of God, a mere truism.

But men have always found it easier to raise an army than to officer it. Sage ancients have avowed that a lion commander with timid hinds in the ranks will defeat lions with a hind in the lead. It is after all true that the thinker saves his people,

and that the general wins the victory. We must see to it that we do not let our stock of thinkers run down too low.

The danger of reaching a minimum of thinkers is always greatest in a new country just after it has gotten over the childhood diseases of settlement and nationality. A new-born nation presents a paradox of cause and effect. At first its very needs and weaknesses force men to think, to trust in God and one another. The very absence of all purchasable luxuries throws contempt upon materialism; they may be superstitious and narrow, but they will be religious and spiritual. Learning, of course, may not flourish in the ordinary sense, but there are "tongues in trees, books in the running brooks, sermons in stones," and these to the pioneer are his free-schools, academies, and colleges.

The proof of all this is the patriotic mould of our own revolutionary times, and the ability of these colonies to evolve the thought of the Declaration and the Constitution, greater feats than to defy the British empire removed by all the waste of the Atlantic from its base of operations. The further proof is seen in the formation of a nation out of thirteen jealous and unequal provinces that had much to lose and much to gain by consenting to accept a common lot. The wonder is not that in our days the attempt should have been made to revoke the compact, but that it had been so well put together that it could not be severed even under the awful strain of states discordant and belligerent.

But now, when pristine virtues have assured peace at home and respect abroad, the avenues of material wealth are opened up. Population flows in, properties rise in value, mineral riches are discovered, manufactures are in demand, commerce flocks to the prosperous strand. What a temptation to adjourn thought, and make money! What a temptation especially in these days when money means foreign travel, books, luxurious home, dainty food and apparel, esthetic entertainment, office, honor, ease, every thing that the Dives family appreciates. Yet, still it is but a temptation, since the faculties bent upon this one thing rust the machine so that it cannot be adjusted to any other occupation at least, and the wealth-seeker's life is ruined

or turned into a sacrifice of dubious utility for a progeny of uncertain aptitude for availing itself of its advantages.

The signs of the times give emphasis to the need of thinkers. We have reached the period of full prosperity and have not yet passed beyond the limit of coining brains into dollars. Our people mostly seem tired of exercising much thought as to their own government. The social structure has been practically entrusted to a set of men, as one of the divisions of labor, whose occupation therein is in turn made a source of revenue rather than of public good. While the higher offices of state and the higher members of this order are somewhat amenable to higher standards, the immense number of lower and local offices are but the rewards of efficiency in one or the other portions of the political army rather than public trusts. Given unthinking masses, and we have them, to be swayed by those most skilled in that branch of work, and soon all offices will be filled by those who are content to find in them an easier or more lucrative gain than they have come upon in other fields of effort. This is our danger. We are a new country and are approximating toward a minimum of thinkers. We see it in the difficulty of attracting men to those callings in which the reward is higher and clearer thought rather than wealth; we find it in the difficulty of getting men to be men outside of their engagement in the more materalizing callings, instead of mere machines rattling away at steam speed and power therein.

It needs no prophet to see that this danger is greatest also in a republic based upon manhood suffrage, and involves all nations in which the tendency is to this same multifarious voice. The theory of manhood suffrage is a noble one, a most satisfactory one. It does away with all the perplexing practical questions about a limitation of the suffrage as conditioned by property or intelligence and satisfies all the requirements, but one. It does not solve the knotty problem of how to get the guarantee that all those who go down in the registration as of the condition of manhood are men! Without men, and with machines, manhood suffrage is a farce, a most lamentable and tragical farce! There is but one hope in it, the hope that the doctrine of chances will equalize its blunders upon serious matters, and that the

minority of thinkers may still be large enough to balance the ship of state by rushing anon to one side and then to the other, still forceful enough to sway the multitude by voice and example to imitate them. The only other hypothesis is that it does not much matter how we are governed, that our good luck will carry us through anyhow, a doctrine quite as popular as it is erroneous; an admirable anodyne, but no specific at all.

There is but little more consolation in the thought that the thinking element of a community may survive among the members of some one class. The hope of a republic is not in having a few brilliantly educated men out of the members of some one class, but in the dissemination of the facilities for thought among all classes. Class leads to caste, and caste leads to inaction. The temptation is too great for poor human nature, and soon, very soon, that is given to a part which was meant for the whole. When the thinkers are all of one class, they are very likely to fall from their high estate and forget the grand and true thought that no policy which is detrimental to a part can be good for the whole, and that whatever is not good for the whole is injurious to every part of it. You cannot increase the perimeter of a circle by bulging it out here, and pinching it in there. You cannot in that way change it at all; as any one knows who has tried to slip one length of stove pipe over another by such violent methods. If, therefore, thinking be remitted to one class, that class will govern to the injury of itself and all the rest. So the priest-caste did in certain nations. The king might be a warrior, but the prime minister was a priest. The prime minister is greater than the king. Roman arms conquered Greece, but Greek thought conquered Rome, and the higher, purer thought of a Jewish peasant, Jesus of Nazareth, prevailed over all their so-called wisdom and subjective religion. The highest conquered; the thinking of the Son of God was the top-stone. Although the builders would have rejected it, they could not; it was the head of the corner, and there it had to be placed at last.

The sacred trust of liberty and true religion necessitates us consequently to think and to foster thought in all its purity and loftiness. We must be men, not machines, or we will become

beasts. We must ponder the relations of cause and effect, giving the divine and spiritual factors full place and honor, or our riches, merely material, will not save us in our time of need. It remains for us now to investigate the methods by which this can be done.

The experience and observation of a life led under the earlier conditions of manhood are impossible for us. We are not in the patriarchal times which fostered meditation, or in the colonial times which developed self-reliant individual action. We must by some artificial process reproduce these phases of mind and so engrave them upon the memory, so train the judgment by them, that the product of our toil shall be a thinker. We must journey by panorama, we must suffer and dare by imagination enkindled by example. The trophies of an Achilles must not permit us to sleep.

This process we call education, and the workshops in which it takes place are our schools. From them we must expect our thinkers, and as we foster them wisely and use them generously, so will the race never die out. Broadly considered, we have a right to demand and expect three things of these schools, in three grades of advancing functional power. First comes the ability to receive thought. With receptive ability infused into the general public mind there will be prepared a sympathetic and appreciative audience for truth and wisdom. Next comes constructive ability. With this the inferences will be made from general laws, and the applications of these laws will be possible. Lastly, and highest of all, and the only truly safe level, is the creative ability of thought, whereby the possessor can and does do his own thinking in all its height and depth, its length and breadth, discovering, inventing, and publishing to others the grand thoughts of truth and of fact, the life-giving and life-sustaining powers. The largest number we can cause to attain to this constitutes our strongest safety.

The function of our lower schools is of necessity and of propriety to foster and develop the receptive powers,—to train to habits of accurate observation, to cultivate the memory and the judgment, to store the mind incidentally with useful facts and to provide a fair apparatus of truth tests and gauges. So much

preparation for living ought to be possible for all, since it requires no more than an average intelligence of the lower sort. Yet even so much would be inestimable in value, if kept up without deterioration after school days are over. Lack of exercise rusts the mind, so that the knowledge once gained is not always retained, and the power to think is diminished also. If the reader of our daily papers read but thoughftully, and tested the statements after the fashion in which his teacher used to probe him at school not very many lies would be accepted as truth.

For it is hard to make a lie stand up or move about as the living truth can, it being but an imitation of life. A walking doll is upset much more easily than a child, and cannot get up half as quickly. Fish will bite at artificial bate, but will not take firm hold and swallow it. Only men have so lost their sense of taste that they will swallow a lie. It is a great matter therefore to have gained at least so much acquaintance with truth as to suspect a lie because of its general look, or its particular statements.

Men often have this discriminating power as to facts, who have but little of it as to truths, simply from lack of training. Tell them of a barn several hundred feet long, and but ten feet wide, and they shake their heads; tell them that by multiplying bank notes, which are evidences of debt, you can increase a nation's wealth, and they agree heartily. So with the many other sophisms of the age; none are so wild or fantastic but that they find some believers whose receptivity is as passive and undiscriminating as that of a mud dredge or railroad excavator. So long as this "fool multitude" exists so long will the quack in church and state flourish as a great power and be revered as some mighty one.

Constructive thought is, of course, of a higher grade, and the work of our higher schools. With it thought assumes the active voice and becomes causative. Condensation and compilation are its favorite fields of toil. Census making, grouping of facts so that they are ready to hand for the more artistic work that is to follow, is one of its utilities. If the making of pig-iron were the first grade of thinking, this would be the convert-

ing of iron into steel. Very much of it has been done in modern times, and very economical work it is. A single volume by reason of it takes the place of a library, a set of books, a dozen or so, brings the whole universe of accomplished thinking within reach. Dictionaries and lexicons embalm in single words and short paragraphs the life work which has settled a root derivation or an obscure ending. All honor to the constructives! Orderly arrangement of that which has been ascertained, and judicial decision as to what has been attained, and not surmised, is the basis of trust-worthy science. These are the books which slap bold assertion in the face, and show him that facts disprove his flaunted hypothesis. This is the arsenal to which one goes for his weapons, when conflicting opinions cannot be silenced without an argumentative duel to the death.

But beyond them all soars the creative mind, the interpreter of heavenly and eternal things, the discoverer of truth, the intellect balanced so finely that it vibrates at a whispered breath, the spirit that seems to walk with God. These, beyond compare, are the world's teachers. Their utterances cannot be bought and sold in the market, but without them life would be stale, flat, and unprofitable. These are the stars that shine out in the darkness of the heavens; for them the voyager on life's ocean looks, and by them he steers.

It may be said that theirs is the gift of genius. Be it so; but what is genius but capacity for work and willingness to do it? Is it a fixed quantity? Is it exempted from the law that he who will not work shall not eat? Are there no gems of genius, of purest ray serene, buried in the dark unfathomed caves of an ocean of fitful indolence, of untrained mind? How can it be proved that there is genius or not unless the mine is worked, the opportunities given, and the tests applied? To it then! Give your mind, and your fellow's mind that chance! See to it that your child and your neighbor's child be brought out into the intellectual and spiritual light at least long enough to demonstrate whether living germs of highest thought be in them or not.

That school whose studies are best fitted for the higher de-

veloping of richest thought is the one called in our land the college. No man who can lay claim to the fair name of student fails to recall the suddenly increased sense of mental power derived from his college course, and especially the studies of his last two years in it. It is not simply the fact that he is so much older in years, but that his horizon has been so much widened that makes him wonder at his former self and its thinking as he reviews his previous course. He has been associating with the great thinkers of the world, old and new, he has been listening to well nigh perfect music, and he marks a discord now where a few years ago he would have applauded the rude strain. He is no longer a wild flower or a weed; he belongs to the cultivated species.

It is this fact which makes it so important for us as churches to furnish the privileges of well endowed, well manned, well equipped colleges to the members of our communion. It is this same fact which makes it so important that they should avail themselves of it, wherever possible, for their sons, and that they should urge it upon others. The college is looked upon too largely as intended only as a preparation for theological studies, or, at widest, for a professional life. It is a grievous mistake. We need thinkers in no one class, in no few classes, but in all classes and occupations. The bread-winning pursuit ought to be considered separate and apart from the man-making preparation. Grant that we lose a little time in getting the machine started; grant that there are tastes fostered which interfere somewhat with the money-making faculty. Is it not better to be more of a man, at the expense of the machine, than to become a perfect machine at the cost of manhood? Which makes our real self? Which goes into heaven? Do we or do we not believe the Word?

Our churches need an educated and thinking laity. It would be a loss and a source of danger for us if only the clergy thought. It would deform the Reformation and make the position of Protestantism an insecure one. The source of our strength and our supplies comes now and always from those who think, and not from the thoughtless. How can you persuade these latter

ones that they have any duty in respect to missions, home or foreign? How can you interest such in doctrinal positions? How can you apply the lessons of history so that such will feel or understand?

Each thoughtful and educated layman is a power, a centre of influence. The creed that has the most of them will become the predominant one. It is not the richest or the most fashionable communion which will sway the world, but the one that thinks most deeply and earnestly. Our Reformation began at a college, a university; without colleges and universities it will die out of inanition.

Let us preach these things to one another and to our young people. Let us say to them, make a man of yourself first and foremost, and your bread shall be added unto you. Manhood itself obliges one to earn his own bread, and blushes at no honest toil for so doing. Manhood does not breed loafers and idlers. Such indeed do come out of colleges, but much as they went into them. Some indolence and ignorance combined is so built up and fostered that it is as impenetrable to better things as a duck's back is to water. Blame not the college for these; blame anything or anybody antecedent to it rather.

Plainly stated, and stated for ourselves, the conclusion of the whole matter is this: We need men, not machines, in our Lutheran Church, both in pulpit and in pew. Lutheran parents ought to esteem it a privilege and a duty to bring their sons to the colleges of their Church that they may acquire thought-power and spiritual force in the direction of that teaching which they believe to be truth. Where we have one such youth, we ought to have dozens. Where one dollar is given to foster such institutions, thousands ought to be given. We, of all Churches, standing as we do upon no one point, but the fully rounded system of the Scriptures, must have men in our folds who are capable of grasping and retaining such a position and base their acceptance of it upon that ability. The whole Gospel, is our cry, the whole Gospel, as well as nothing but the Gospel. Then we must educate, and educate broadly and deeply and thoroughly. We must uphold our colleges that they may uphold us. Layman and clergyman must have this added bond of fel-

lowship, that they were trained to think by the same *Alma Mater*, and are working together in intelligent consensus as to their duties.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### THE PREPARATORY SERVICE IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

By Rev. J. A. Earnest, A. M., Mifflinburg, Pa.

A service of some sort preparatory to the administration of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our blessed Lord, is neither peculiar to nor distinctive of the Lutheran Church, as a like usage obtains in the other branches of the Church of the Reformation, viz: Zwinglian, Anglican and Calvinistic. Nor, indeed, is the practice of a preparatory service of some sort and somehow conducted, a new thing in modern times and peculiar to the modern Church, but it is a service in entire harmony with Apostolic injunction and primitive usage. "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup," is Paul's injunction to the Corinthians: and wherefore? "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." And in "*The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*," come to light in recent years by discovery of Bryennios, chap. 14 : 2, we read, "On the Lord's day do you assemble and break bread, and give thanks, *after confessing your transgressions*, in order that your sacrifice may be pure. But every man that hath controversy with his friend *let him not come* together with you, *until* they be reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be profaned."

To those who are at all acquainted with the confessional teaching of the Lutheran Church, it is known, that she accords to the sacraments a high place as media of grace and blessing to faith; that she, therefore, insists upon baptism, rightly administered, as necessary, because therein "grace is offered;" that she regards the sacrament of the Lord's Supper of the highest importance and of especial value as a means of grace, and believes that therein the *believer* is brought into the most intimate communion and fellowship with his Lord, whilst he, who

with unclean hands and an impure heart or with indifferent and impenitent feelings uses the Holy ordinance, does so unto deep condemnation; that she has ever regarded this holy Sacrament "as a high mystery which bears in itself a power to bless and to destroy," and it is therefore not to be approached unto without an especial preparation; that she holds the Church and ministerial office to be divine institutions for the administration of the word and sacraments, through which, as instrumental means, the Holy Ghost works in men repentance and faith and a progressive sanctification unto eternal life.

Wherefore also, her ministry is not a lectureship to be listened to and patronized while it pleases, nor a leadership "simply invested with such rights as are derived from the vote of the Church," but a divine office clothed with authority to perform duties and functions divinely prescribed and defined; and therefore, with literal acceptance she believes when her Lord declares, "He that heareth you, heareth me." "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Hence, to her conception, the duties committed to this office are the following: To preach the gospel, to announce the remission of sins, to administer the sacraments, and excommunicate the ungodly "*through the word*," and therefore recognizes also a *pastoral* administration of the Gospel, both in word and sacrament for the spiritual nurture and development of the souls gathered by its public proclamation.

In view of all this, it would be antecedently expected that her preparatory service would be in accord with her faith, and that its form would be definitely specified. And so it is. She has a pastoral theology and pastoral methods which she offers to those who minister at her altars; and both attest her profound conception of the work and responsibility of the pastor as also of the nearness and importance of his relation to the "flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made him overseer, *to feed* the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood;" and attest also the absolute demand she makes for faith in the use of the means of grace as ordained by the Lord.

What, then, is her preparatory service; and what its form?

It is not merely a divine service or services preceding the celebration of the holy communion,—and of a general character; but a specific service in which the hymns and prayers and the theme of the preacher's discourse are all directed to the one great end of assisting the soul in the self-examination, which according to St. Paul, 1 Cor. 11 : 27–29, is so needful to "a worthy reception of the Holy Supper."

This service embodies itself in threefold form, viz.: 1. Self-examination; 2. Confession; and, 3. Absolution,—the first being *in order to* the second and third. The first is the act of the individual, thereunto assisted and prepared by the presentation of the spirit and law of the Christian life as set forth in the commandments of God and revealed in the life and the Gospel of our blessed Lord. The second is the penitential act of the humble spirit and of the broken and contrite heart in response to the following questions addressed to the congregation, standing: "I ask you, my friends, before the omniscient God, and upon the evidence of your consciences, whether you are sensible, and with contrite hearts acknowledge and lament, not only that you are by nature sinners, but that you have in various ways, by the omission of duty and by sinful thoughts, desires, words and actions, transgressed God's holy will and commandments, and that you have thus grieved and offended the Lord your God and Saviour, and exposed yourselves to the punishment due to the guilty? If such be your sincere conviction, make it manifest by saying, Yes."

"I ask you whether you truly believe that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, and that all who sincerely repent and believe in his name, shall receive the forgiveness of their sins? And is it, therefore, your heartfelt desire to be delivered from your sin and guilt, and are you persuaded that our heavenly Parent is willing, for Christ's sake, to be gracious unto you, and to cleanse you from all unrighteousness, and through the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit to render you meet for the inheritance of the saints in light? If such faith be yours, manifest it by saying, Yes."

"I ask you whether, in accordance with the acknowledgment and profession which you have now made, you are truly resolved

to submit yourselves henceforth to the influence and direction of the Holy Spirit, that through his instruction and assistance you may evermore hate and forsake all manner of evil, and not only strive to serve God and to glorify his name by your daily walk and conversation, but faithfully improve all the means of grace to your constant advancement in holiness of heart and life? If this be your serious resolution, announce it in the presence of God and of each other by saying, Yes."

This confession, profession and resolution having been made and declared, the whole congregation then kneels, and the pastor offers a prayer of confession, after which, the congregation having arisen, he announces absolution as follows: "Upon this humble confession which you have made to him who looketh on the heart, and in conformity to the instructions which the head of the Church hath given to the minister of the word, I declare to you all who have sincerely repented of your sins, and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, the divine promise of the forgiveness of your transgressions, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And then closes by admonishing and warning "all to guard against self-deception and hypocrisy, because the sins of hypocrites and unbelievers God will not pardon, notwithstanding their formal confession."

It is peculiar to and distinctive of the Lutheran Church, however, that she restored and *retained* the usages which prevailed in the sacramental services during the second, third and fourth centuries, when the Church's practice was largely determined by the conviction, "that men ought never partake of the Holy Supper except after a very especial preparation of the heart." (Neander, Ch. Hist., vol. 1, p. 333.) And it is proper to say, that in the Reformation, this preparation for the sacrament by self-examination, confession and absolution was not as now, general, and in presence of the congregation, but was individual and private; and in regard to which the Church has put herself upon record with the utmost definiteness and precision. (Augs. Conf. Art. XI.): "In reference to confession they teach, that private absolution ought to be retained in the Church, and should not be discontinued." (XXV. Art.): "Confession is not abolished in our Churches. For the custom is retained among

us, not to administer the sacrament to those who have not been previously examined and absolved. At the same time the people are diligently instructed how consoling the word of absolution is, and how highly absolution should be valued, as being not the word of the present (officiating) human being, but the word of that God who pardons sin; for it is pronounced in God's stead, and by his authority." (From the Apology, New Market edition, Book of Concord, p. 236.): "Now the power of the keys announces to us the Gospel through absolution; for absolution proclaims peace to the soul, and is the Gospel itself. When we hear absolution, that is, the promise of divine grace, or the Gospel, our hearts and consciences are consoled. We should, therefore, esteem or believe the words of absolution no less than the clear voice of God from heaven." (Smalcald Articles, p. 386): "Since absolution or the power of the keys, instituted in the Gospel by Christ, affords comfort and support against sin and an evil conscience, confession or absolution shall by no means be abolished in the Church, especially on account of weak and timid consciences and also on account of untutored youth, in order that they may be examined and instructed in the Christian doctrine."

Now, as these terms belong to the theological nomenclature of an age long past, and no longer much studied, it is pertinent to inquire: What is this confession and absolution? The time was when the answer leaped quickly to the lips,—"Why, it is the tyranny of priestcraft, the spiritual despotism of popery; the enslavement of the soul in bondage to ecclesiasticism." But hold. Is it set forth as a doctrine to be believed, and involving a priestly function which must be submitted to under penalty of ecclesiastical anathema? So it has been said. And by unthinking, unreasoning and uninquiring men, Lutherans have been stigmatized and contemned as being but "disguised Romanists;" and their confession and absolution only "modified auricular confession" with its conditioning penance and priestly absolution. What a wickedness, that any man who can read Latin or German or only English, should so utter himself. Doctrine to be believed? No! On the contrary it is distinctly affirmed, (Art. XXV. Augs. Conf.): "Confession is of human

right only, is not commanded in Scripture, but has been instituted by the Church. (Larger Catechism, Book of Concord, p. 544): "For this confession is not embraced in a command but is left optional with every one who needs it, to use it to his necessity." A priestly function which must be submitted to? Nothing like it. (Art. XXV. Augs. Conf.): "It is our *custom* not to administer" etc. Already in the *Schwabach Articles* Luther expressed himself as follows: "Private confession is not to be made compulsory by law;" and in the Larger Catechism in this wise: "In reference to confession we have ever taught, that it should be free, that the tyranny of the pope should be put down, and that we should be liberated from all his constraints and relieved from the intolerable burdens imposed on the Christian community. For hitherto, as we have all experienced, nothing has been more grievous than the compulsion of every one to confession, at the hazard of incurring the highest displeasure."

It is, therefore, very apparent, that the confession of the Lutheran symbols is not a law, not an absolute requirement, nor *in order to be shrived by a priest*—but a privilege of which a soul in anxiety, distress or doubt may avail itself; and it is just as apparent, that the absolution announced to the penitent soul, is not a judicial or "creative," but merely a declarative act, wherein the awakened and inquiring soul is assured, that "there is forgiveness with God, that he may be feared;" and the heart of the believer temporarily sad by a sense of sin, is helped and comforted by the assurance, "If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, even Jesus Christ the righteous." "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." This is the absolution of the Augs. Conf. which we are exhorted "to esteem." And wherefore esteem? Because announced by a priest, and on condition of a confession of all sins to him antecedently made and submission to such penance as he may impose? By no means. But because it is the word of God—the good tidings of great joy, which it is the preacher's first duty to tell to all people; and to comfort God's people with the

doctrine of the Gospel. "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned."* Hence in the language of Melanchthon, Book of Concord, p. 240: "Absolution is nothing but the Gospel, a divine promise of the grace and favor of God. Therefore no one can possess or obtain it, except through faith. For how can the declarations of absolution benefit those who do not believe them?"

It is yet to be added, that of priestly function and its authority to institute ordinances and bind them upon the conscience, the Lutheran Church knows nothing—as she acknowledges no priesthood except the priesthood of all believers; and no authority, but such as is delegated and conferred by the word of God. In reference to the power of the clergy, she expresses herself with the utmost definiteness in the XXVIII. Art. of the Confession. We quote from Krauth's translation: "It remaineth, then, that (seeing ordinations, constituted as necessary, or with the opinion of meriting grace, are repugnant to the Gospel) it is not lawful for any bishops to institute or exact such worship. For it is necessary that the doctrine of Christian liberty should be maintained in the churches. It is necessary that the chiefest point of all the Gospel should be holden fast, that we do freely obtain grace, by faith in Christ, not because of certain observances, or of services devised by men." "It is lawful for bishops or pastors to make ordinances, whereby things may be done in order in the Church; not that by them we may merit grace, or satisfy for sins, or that men's consciences should be bound to esteem them as necessary services, and think that they sin when they violate them:" and "such ordinances it behooveth the churches to keep for charity and quietness' sake, so that one offend not another, that all things may be done in order, and without tumult in the Church."

The confession of the Lutheran symbols, therefore, is not an obligation on part of the communicant, nor is absolution a priestly function of the ministerial office, but is a pastoral *method*

---

*Isa. 40 : 1–2.

whereby the duties of the *pastoral* work of the preacher are to be performed; and in which there is not even a shadow of the priestly domination of Romish confession. On the contrary, it is the positive declaration, "that Auricular Confession, requiring the mention of an offence as a preliminary to its absolution, is contrary to holy Scripture." It is human suggestion, not divine command. And as a suggestion, it is not the experiment or proposition of an individual, but the mature judgment of the combined wisdom of the Church; and is, moreover, in complete harmony with her faith regarding the pastoral function to which the New Testament commits the spiritual oversight of the Church: "Take heed, therefore, with yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood," Acts 20 : 28. "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you," Heb. 13 : 17.

Now, as a pastoral method, its efficacy and value, and its adaptation as a means to an end, may properly be made the subject of criticism. And when thus inquired into and tried, then, like all other things human, it must stand or fall upon its merits. Let us then look at it fairly and, if possible, without prejudice. What is the longing desire of every sincere, earnest man, who appreciates the duties and responsibilities of the Christian ministry, but that in his office he may be helpful and useful to mankind in the highest possible degree? In order to this, however, he must have opportunity of access to men; first as preacher to awaken attention and inquiry, and then as pastor to direct and assist, to guide and keep. The pulpit will secure opportunity for the preacher; and will not our pastoral method which secures a perfectly free, personal interview between the pastor and the individual, secure the opportunity which the pastor needs for his specific work, which is to bring up his spiritual children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord?" Its adaptation to this end is very forcibly set forth by the Wittenberg Faculty of 1619 in the three particular reasons they give for observing it: 1. "It affords a pastor an opportunity for spe-

cial interviews with each communicant, to ascertain whether he is properly qualified for that holy ordinance: that is, whether he has thoroughly examined himself as St. Paul requires; whether he has proper views of the nature and design of the Lord's Supper; whether he lives at peace with his neighbors; whether he is really willing to renounce all evil ways in which he may have been living; and whether, in a word, any defect may be found in the applicant, which through instruction and exhortation might be remedied. 2. It affords also an appropriate opportunity to any member that may have any special difficulties, wants or desires in reference to which he may wish an interview with his pastor alone. 3. It affords opportunity to apply in a personal and direct way, to the individual and contrite conscience, God's grace and forgiveness of sins, which, in a general way, are offered to all believers in the word." LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Vol. 6, p. 495.

What earnest pastor, who bears upon his heart the burden of a great anxiety for the spiritual and eternal welfare of his people, and feels, that of the real inner life of many of them he knows very little, wherefore much of his work on their behalf is a bow drawn at a venture, who would not avail himself of some such method of pastoral work, if he could: that is, avail himself of an acknowledged and practiced usage, which would afford the opportunity to ascertain the thought and feeling, the inner life of his parishioner? Is it not reasonable to believe, that some such method faithfully and rightly used, would be productive of most blessed results? And is it not to be feared, that for lack of it the enemy is successfully at work where we do not at all suspect him, until a defalcation, a suicide, or some other hidden sin coming to light, reveals the fact.

But let us see how our pastoral method of over three hundred and fifty years ago, compares with those used by the denominations to-day, or with the usages of earnest men, who have put themselves upon record in regard to this matter? For the oversight of the flock, and for the nurture of the Christian life of the individual, Methodism with its "class meeting" more nearly than any other method now used, secures the end contemplated by our usage: the difference being, that in the one

instance the spiritual oversight is committed to a layman, in the other, to the minister of the Gospel. There is also the "inquiry meeting" come into use with a view to the same end—namely, to secure opportunity for personal and private interview. But this is only a special usage and employed mainly in evangelistic work, which creates the demand for our usage or that of the "class meeting," whereby the sowing of the evangelist must be watched over unto growth and fruitage. And now when, for further comparison, we inquire concerning the usages of earnest and successful pastors, that is, successful in winning men to Christ, and afterward developing in them a high standard of spiritual excellence, we refer to Dr. Charles A. Stork, of blessed memory, who has put himself upon record in regard to this matter, in this QUARTERLY, vol. 12, pp. 415–431—Topic: "*The Pastor's Use of the Lord's Supper.*" Dr. Stork bears his testimony to the difficulty that besets pastoral work, because "the hedges of social conventions and the complexity of our modern civilization stand in the way of a close intimacy of the pastor with his people." He feels the need of opportunity and of occasion for this work, and in looking about, finds both in "special seasons, such as the Easter time or Whitsunday" and in the regularly recurring sacramental service. To secure both the occasion and opportunity to be *pastorally* helpful, he says, "It is well often to appoint a time and place at which those who wish to see the pastor particularly with reference to some personal experience of difficulty, trial, perplexity, may meet him." And adds, "I have never made such arrangements, that some most interesting cases were not opened, and great help afforded." In regard to the great value of such interviews, whether secured before or after the communion season: before, by a usage to that end, as the above arrangement, or afterward, by making absence from communion the opportunity for pastoral visitation and inquiry; he says, "It (such interview) affords an opportunity for instruction, admonition, encouragement, rebuke, discipline, which is direct, personal and most effective. In the exercise of it the pastor will come to know his people intimately. He discovers those whose timidity keeps them away, those who are living in secret sin, who are in a quarrel with their brethren;

those who have erroneous views of the sacrament, and the proper preparation for it. Peculiar perplexities he will light on: he will rescue often from evil those whom he thought were standing well. There are those in every congregation, who with an outward show of regularity and good standing are secretly drifting away into the darkest night." How remarkably and entirely Dr. Stork is in accord with the doctors of the Wittenburg Faculty of over two hundred and fifty years ago. How they both utter themselves in almost the same words, and breathe the same pastoral fervor, and embody the same pastoral anxiety for the spiritual welfare of the souls "over whom the Holy Ghost had made them overseers." But, we all know, Dr. Stork was not a formalist nor a fossil theologian, but a man as remarkable for spiritual power as he was distinguished for intellectual force; and who lives to-day in the well ordered life of a congregation, which in all the elements of a true Church life, has few equals and no superiors in our entire communion. And yet how hard it is for some preachers and pastors who minister in Lutheran pulpits and at Lutheran altars, to discover Dr. Stork's spirit and work in the life and work of the men, who two and three hundred years ago practiced the pastoral methods of the Lutheran Symbols; a period which produced a hymnology and devotional literature confessedly unequaled by anything produced since that day. Should not then a pastoral usage of such sort commend itself to every earnest heart? Truly it would seem so. And yet it is just this heritage of the fathers that the modern Church has dropped out of her life and polity; and it is to be feared greatly to her disadvantage.

But we are told, we live in a progressive age, and all our methods, whether commercial, political, social or domestic, must be adapted to the spirit of the times;—are told, that the spirit of the age will not endure the ways and things of the past, and in response to the demand have come readjustments of the old, which, in the sphere of religion, have issued in the greatest variety of new theologies. But what is the moral product? Is it, in the main, a higher consecration, a purer and truer devotion to truth and duty? Has society in general been thereby made better, made more contented and happy? Is political life

cleaner and domestic life purer? and is the Church purer and truer to her great mission?

For answer we will give place to one in every way, by intelligence and opportunity for observation, qualified to do so; namely, Phillips Brooks. We quote from Lecture VII, in his "*Lectures on Preaching*;" what the "commercial and social and political movements which go on about us, give us to fear, is the magnifying of second causes to the forgetfulness of the first cause and the final cause of things." "We need to remember as we preach, with what enormous urgency this danger is pressing upon the lives of the men and women to whom our preach- is addressed." "It seems to the business man as if Wealth were the king of everything; as if it made reputation, made happiness, almost made character. It seems to the man or woman of society as if Fashion, in some supreme reserve of queenship, were the supreme arbiter of destiny." "This is the world to which we have to bring the Gospel, the story that begins with, 'God created the heaven and the earth,' and goes on with the record of God's power and love until it comes to the prophecy of the spiritual judgment day. What can we do to get that story of the one first cause home to the heart of this eager, feverish age, worshiping in its pantheon of second causes? First, O my brothers, who are to be pastors of the Church, we can take watchful care, that the Church herself is true to her belief in God as the source of all power. One of the most terrible signs of how the spirit of sordidness has filled the world, is the lamentable extent to which it has pervaded the Church. The Church is constantly found trusting in second causes as if she knew of no first cause. She elaborates her machineries as if the power lay in them. She goes, cap in hand, to rich men's doors, and flatters them and dares not tell them of their sins, because she wants their money. She lets her officers conduct her affairs with all the arts of a transaction on the street or an intrigue in politics, or only shows her difference of standards, and freedom from responsibility, by some advantage taken, who not even the conscience of the exchange or of the caucus would allow. She degrades the dignity of her grand commission by puerile devices for raising money, and frantic efforts to keep

herself before the public, which would be fit only for the sordid ambitions of a circus troupe. You must cast all that out of the church with which you have to do, or you will make its pulpit perfectly powerless to speak of God to our wealth-ridden and pleasure-loving time." If the methods of to-day are so superior to those of the past, it is very certain that the above condition of things as the result of their operation, does not attest them so. And in the absence of better results, it is not wonderful, that men great and good, have much regretted the disuse of a pastoral usage, which at stated times brought a man face to face with himself, that he might ask himself "Where am I? What am I doing? Where am I going?"

Olshausen, 1 Cor. 11 : 27–29, "It were much to be desired, that the practice of real private confession were still retained instead of a general admonition being substituted in its place." And Tholuck, the beloved and revered Hallean Professor, "mourning that private confession had fallen, accounting the loss of it as among the 'injuries and wounds of the Church,' appeals to the students of theology before whom he preached: 'Ye that are to be ministers of the Word in time to come, regard it as your vocation, to heal these wounds of our Church, and to restore it to *private confession*, not auricular confession which this article (XI. Augs. Conf.) rejects.'" And Hase, the distinguished church historian of Jena, has said: "The Church, by permitting this article of her faith to become obsolete, has suffered to go down one of the most efficient means at her command, to care for the souls of her children." Of it Dr. Krauth, Jr., says, that "in the hands of faithful men it has done more than all other human arrangements for maintaining a living piety and a pure discipline in the Church." And its influence as a means helpful to individual spiritual culture is attested as far back in history as the middle of the third century, when the patriarch of Constantinople forbade a similar method of preparation for the Holy Communion, "allowing each individual, according to his conscience, to partake in the communion," but the abolition of the custom, says the ancient church historian, Sozomene, "had an injurious influence on the general state of morals." (Neander, Ch. Hist., vol. 2, p. 181.)

The writer hereof is firm in the conviction, that if every Lutheran pastor were to study the Scriptures with the assistance of the pastoral literature of the Church upon this topic, and with the assistance of the personal and pastoral experience of such men as Gerhard and Arndt and Spener and Francke and Claus Harms, were to catch the real genius and spirit of this time-honored usage, they would resurrect a power and employ a means which would be effective, as is none other now operated, against the Antinomian pietism of these days, when a Pelagian theology carries the appeal to the subjective reason and consciousness instead of to the objective rule and law as revealed in Holy Scripture. And, furthermore, he is as firm in the conviction, that if the Church is to be delivered from the Laodicean delusion which seems to have overtaken her, when the boastful response to spiritual exhortation is, "We are rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing," and restored to a better experience, then her pastors must recognize the authority vested in their office, and must have the courage to exercise it. And to "ambidexters in religion," who like Redwald of old of whom it is said, that he must have in his Church one altar for the Christian religion, and another for sacrificing to devils;" or, who like Rufus, of a later date, "who painted God on one side of his shield, and the devil on the other, with the inscription beneath *In utramque paratus*," they must say, "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils;" and in exercise of their authority as servants of the Lord Jesus Christ, must say to them, as did the great Ambrose, bishop of Milan, to the great Emperor, Theodosius I. "Ye shall not," and withhold from them the offices of the Church. Under a pastoral administration like this, it seems to me men could hardly go on in secret sin, and, while in reputation for godliness and goodness, end up in discovering to the world an inner life utterly corrupt and godless.

And now, let not our suggestions as to the excellence of this pastoral usage be opposed with its perversion and abuse in the past—for this would be puerile. This sort of reasoning or ap-

peal, is what Prof. Stanley Jevons calls the *argumentum ad populum*, designed to excite the feelings and prevent dispassionate judgment upon the matter in hand: "the great weapon of rhetoricians and demagogues." And Canon Farrar in a recent *Lecture on the History of Exegesis* before the students of the Episcopal Divinily School in Philadelphia, dealt with this sort of appeal on this wise: "Luther is often held responsible for all the vagaries of fanaticism and rationalism that attended and followed the Reformation. But you may as well hold Paul accountable for Marcion, as Luther for Strauss." And in regard to his revilers, he said: "Would to God the greatest of those who depreciate and revile him would render the Church and the world the very least of the least which he gave them." So say we to such as would stigmatize and contemn our pastoral method by holding it responsible for the whole false and ruinous system of Romish penance.

Let Lutheran pastors, therefore, cherish this our preparatory service and impress themselves and their people with its great spiritual benefit and consequent importance to our advancement in spiritual religion. And may the day hasten when a better and more general knowledge and a juster appreciation of our heritage from the fathers will beget a courage that will exercise itself in a pastoral method, that is distinctively our own, and which will everywhere commend itself to right reason and common sense.

# ARTICLE VII.

## CHRISTIAN PREACHING: ITS MATERIAL AND ITS END.

By Rev. Prof. J. W. Richard, A. M., Springfield, Ohio.

Preaching is peculiar to Christianity. Something remotely similar to it was found in the service of the Jewish prophets; but prophecy had neither the consistency, nor the persistency; neither the richness of material, nor the oneness of aim, which characterize Christian preaching. Heathenism has never had an order of men, nor an office, devoted to the propagation of its tenets by the living voice lifted up in public commendation of its gods and in advocacy of its systems of falsehoods and superstition.

Preaching, etymologically considered, means heralding, announcing. Hence Christian preaching means heralding or announcing the things of Christ. This at once discloses,

### I. THE MATERIAL OF CHRISTIAN PREACHING.

As all the things of Christ, that is, all the facts of his incarnation, life, suffering, death, resurrection, ascension, session at the right hand of the Father; all the doctrines of his grace and of his continued activity in the world, both personally and through the agency and energy of the Holy Ghost, are found in the word of God, and in that alone; it follows that the word of God, and that alone, is the primary and principal material of Christian preaching. But by the word of God is meant the entire canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; for these constitute the word of God as known to us, and may in general be said to relate directly or indirectly to Christ, who therefore ought to be first and last in all preaching. Not indeed that Christ should appear with equal prominence in every sermon preached, nor even with special prominence in this or that particular sermon; but all preaching should have its centre in Christ and be for Christ's sake and in Christ's name, and should be fortified and verified by a word of God, or should be the de-

velopment of some truth, or the application of some fact, having as its ultimate object the leading of men to Christ, or the strengthening of their faith in Christ.

This being the case, Christ himself is really, in ultimate analysis, the subject or material of Christian preaching, as by it Christ is shown to the Church and to the world. That is, Christian preaching is heralding Christ, his person, his life, his doctrine, to the people, a quality which distinguishes Christian preaching from any and all other discourse delivered before men. And it is just this quality, namely, the heralding of Christ, that makes Christian preaching a hammer, a sword, for destroying the antagonisms of evil, and a word of truth, a power of God, for the edification of the body. For as on the one hand it sets forth Christ as a Prince and a Saviour, it not only becomes a means of opposing evil, but it becomes Christ in direct conflict with the powers of evil; and as on the other hand it sets him forth as the Head of the Church, it becomes the Lord himself, the living Incarnate Word who builds up the Church, that the whole body fitly framed together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, may grow into a holy temple, and be builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit. For as sitting at the right hand of God and having all power in heaven and in earth, being both omnipotent and omniscient, being the Truth and the Light, he is ever present with his word in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, to give that word its unction, its authority, its energy as a divine word of life. For as the apostleship is "not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father," so preaching is not the speaking ordained by man, nor by a synod of men; nor is it a word of man about Christ; but it is the essential Christ himself in the word personally coöperating with those who preach the word, through the agency of the Holy Spirit, of whom he said: "He shall take the things of mine and shall show them to you; and he shall glorify me." That is, he brings not the dead history of Christ, but he brings the Incarnate Word himself, who says, "My words; they are spirit and they are life," and who makes the word of God the vehicle of the personal manifestation of himself in grace and

love to all who hear the word with obedience and faith. And thus it is that the proper preaching of the pure word, with which Christ is personally identified, through the Spirit, is as efficacious in awakening and strengthening faith as Christ himself was when he moved bodily among men; yea, even more so, for Christ promised his disciples (John 14 : 12) that they should do greater works than he had done, which was verified on the day of Pentecost and at various times during the ministry of the apostles; and is yet being verified in the triumphs of the Gospel among the heathen, and possibly even among ourselves. That is, the Gospel, or the word, is still the power of God unto salvation. In the preaching of it carnal ears may hear only the word of man; just as when Christ moved visibly on earth, carnal eyes saw only the carpenter's son. But as spiritual eyes saw under that bodily form and beneath that homely exterior, the Christ, the Son of the living God; so the understandings of those whom the Spirit has quickened, will see in the preaching of the word, the living personal Christ who proves and manifests his gracious, saving and sanctifying power in that word, and who through that word dwells personally in the heart of every believer,—"I in them and they in me"—not metaphorically or ideally or dynamically through the recollection and representation of his virtues, merits and achievements as of one who had lived, suffered and died; but as an ever-present personality, as of one who liveth and was dead, and behold is alive forevermore, and has the keys of death and hell; so that we can say with Paul, "I know whom I have believed," and with Peter, "Whom having not seen ye love; on whom, though ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable and full of glory."

From this follow two things: First, the abiding necessity of preaching the word, as the sole means by which Christ is brought into the consciousness of the believer,* (Rom. 10 : 14; John 10

*"You must *by yourself and in your conscience feel Christ himself, and unchangeably experience that it is God's Word.* * * * The Master *teaches in the heart*—through the external word of his preachers, indeed, who bring the word into the ear; but *Christ brings it into the heart.*" Luther.

: 14; Eph. 3 : 12;) and secondly, since preaching is the ordained means "unto the building up of the body of Christ," (Eph. 4 : 11, 12), the preacher is not the organ of the Church to voice its sentiments, and to declare its consciousness, but he is the minister of the word, the organ of God, the setter forth of the law and the testimony, the deliverer of a positive message, the expounder of an objective word, which in important points may even contradict the sentiments of the local congregation which has been led astray by worldliness or by the partial apprehension of the word, or "by the sleight of men in craftiness, after the wiles of error," and which must be brought back again to the norm of truth, "unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God," by the exhibition of the unchanging word, and by the historic consciousness and true testimony of the witnessing *sancta catholica ecclesia* as she has received and kept the faith once delivered to the saints,—which same historic consciousness and true testimony of the Church is embodied in the ancient ecumenical creeds, which must be allowed to stand not only as landmarks and stadia of the Church's progress towards her goal, but as the Church's experience and confession of the truth wrought in her by the Holy Ghost who was given to guide her into all truth; in which operation of the Holy Ghost she is bound to claim *illuminatio interpretandi Scripturam*, and exemption from all material error; otherwise the *sancta ecclesia catholica* would have perished, and the gates of hell would have prevailed against her, contrary to the promise of Christ, Matt. 16 : 18. But if the historic testimony and the confessed faith of the *sancta ecclesia catholica* may be used in correcting, purifying and normalizing the partial faith and aberrant consciousness of the local congregation, or of any number of congregations belonging to an age or a country; then it follows that the historical faith of the Church, that is, what she has officially witnessed and confessed in regard to the word of God, becomes (in a secondary and subordinate sense, as a witness and not as a judge) also a part of the material of Christian preaching, since by it the preacher is guided and assisted in the true interpretation and right application of the word of God. For while the word of God undoubtedly has the *facultas se ip-*

*sum interpretandi* in all things necessary to salvation; yet it requires a knowledge of the historic faith of the Church to save the preacher from a false subjectivism, and to give him a proper appreciation of the relative importance of the different doctrines taught in the word as constituting a symmetrical whole, which it is the preacher's task to interpret and apply to the Church in order to effect her normal development, which, other things being equal, will always be in proportion as she has the truth in objective completeness. Besides, the preacher who has recourse to the historic testimony of the Church as an assistant and a guide (not as of absolute and final authority) in the interpretation and application of the truth, thereby in his preaching confesses his faith in the Holy Catholic Church, which the Holy Ghost has sanctified and "preserves in Christ in the only true faith," (Smaller Catechism); whereas that preaching which ignores the historic testimony of the Church claims for itself, consciously or unconsciously, just what it is unwilling to allow to the Church, viz., the light and guidance of the Holy Ghost in conserving, interpreting and applying the truth of the word; and hence it is sure to become another gospel, and to manifest the presence of another spirit,*—a kind of preaching which may have in it some particular phase of truth, but which cannot have the truth in its fulness and symmetrical body, and which therefore becomes sectarianizing in its character, distracting and wounding the body of Christ. Whereas that preaching

*Here doubtless is the cause of the very wide difference between Luther and Zwingli: The former, notwithstanding his absolute reliance on the word of God and his claim for it of the *facultas se ipsum interpretandi*, nevertheless had very great regard for what the Holy Ghost had taught the Church. This is seen not only in the fact that he allowed everything to remain which was not irreconcilable with the word of God; but much more, in the fact that he published the three ecumenical creeds in German *that he might show that he held the true Christian Church which had these creeds.* The latter, without deep religious experience, did violence to his own *formal principle*—the word of God—by his subjective interpretations, almost entirely ignoring the operation of the Spirit in the Church. As a consequence he went astray on many points of fundamental doctrine, as is indubitably evidenced by his Confession of Faith sent to Augsburg. He well deserved Luther's charge: Ihr habt einen audern Geist, denn wir.

which holds fast the historic faith of the Church and expounds that faith as it has been established through prayer and meditation and experience, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, and verified in the consciousness of saints and martyrs who willingly gave up everything for that faith,—such preaching will edify the body of Christ, and stablish the Church, and make her the very pillar and ground of the truth.

This is an important conclusion. It shows the practical value to the Church of her creeds and confessions as a part of the real and legitimate material of Christian preaching, through which she is held in the normal line of her historic development, and by which, when she has wandered from that line, she may be brought back again to the confession and experience of the truth. Wherefore it is not enough for a man to say, "I preach according to the Bible." As well might a professor of science say, "I teach astronomy according to the stars, and geology according to the rocks."* The question is, "What do the stars, what do the rocks teach?" "When the facts of the stars and of the rocks are classified and systematized, what do they tell us?" The question which should be asked of every candidate for holy orders is, "What is the systematized truth of the Bible, what does the Bible teach? Does it teach the fatherhood of God? the divinity of Christ? the personality of the Holy Ghost? the immortality of the soul? salvation by grace? the punishment of the wicked? When the candidate gives answer in harmony with the ecumenical testimony of the Church which has the Holy Ghost to guide her into all truth, and the promise of the Lord that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, then we allow that he may become a teacher and a guide in the Church; otherwise, not.

The Bible is the rule of faith, the very pure and sacred fountain of Israel. Nothing is to be taught or believed as necessary to salvation which is not revealed and expressed in the Bible. This is the infallible standard, the final judge. But the office of the Confession is to set forth what we understand the doctrine of the Bible to be. It is the Church's answer in human language to the question, What does the Bible teach? Every

**Conservative Reformation,* p. 166.

sermon is the preacher's confession. In that he states in human language his faith in regard to the teaching of the word of God, and presses what he preaches upon the consciences of his hearers, under the conviction that it expresses the doctrine of the word. But history and observation overwhelm us with the proof that no man can attain to a correct systematic apprehension of the teaching of God's word, who ignores those explications of doctrine which the Holy Ghost and her own experience of salvation have taught the Church; and without this systematic apprehension, no man can preach to the proper edifying and unifying of the body of Christ. Hence with every sermon not improperly comes the question, What has the Holy Catholic Church taught on that subject? That settled, the character of the preaching is settled so far as its orthodoxy and the legitimacy of the material is concerned. The preacher's task now is to develop that teaching, to expand it and to apply it to the needs of the hour, by a personal study of the divine word, guided by a living faith and by the Holy Ghost.

In support of this proposition, viz., that it is the preacher's duty to pay due regard to the historic faith of the Church, and to employ it as a guide in the interpretation and application of the word, we may appeal to the testimony of history in regard to the traditional* faith of the Church. It is an historical fact that all the fanaticism and false illuminism, and shallow spiritualism, and arbitrary subjectivism, and tyrannical ecclesiasticism, which have existed in connection with Christianity and

*There is a true tradition and there is a false tradition. The former holds organic connection with the Scriptures and recognizes the presence and operation of the Holy Ghost in the Church in her historic development. Matthew Flacius has shown in his Catalogus Testium Veritatis, that the Church has had an unbroken line of devout, learned, capable and heroic defenders of the faith, extending from the apostles to the days of the Reformers. These constitute the Holy Catholic Church, and their faith is the true traditional faith of the church. The latter separated itself from organic connection with the Scriptures, and substituted for doctrines the commandments of men. This is Romanism, which was as energetically resisted by Luther and his co-laborers, as the true tradition was zealously defended.

have drowned men in destruction and perdition, have come from ignoring the ecumenical testimony of the Church, and from preaching and teaching out of an individual consciousness which set up its own wisdom and piety as superior to the wisdom and piety of the Church. We need refer only to the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century and to the many sects and sectaries of the nineteenth, which have brought confusion, disorder and scandal to the Church. On the contrary all the great revivals of religion have come from preaching the divine word as taught and understood and confessed by the early Church in her formularies and official declarations of doctrine. For instance, the Lutheran Reformation was not the preaching of a new gospel or the starting of a new church. Every fundamental principle of that great awakening was as old as the day of Pentecost. It was brought about by going back through a thousand years of darkness and corruption to build again the walls of Jerusalem on the old foundations* laid by the fathers; who had recognized justification by faith as the chief citadel of the Church, and had given the Scriptures to the people, in their own vernacular, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

The pietistic revival of Spener was brought about by a return to the faith and practice of the Reformation Fathers, by and through the Confession and the word of God, by neither ignoring the one nor handling deceitfully the other.†

The Wesleyan revival in England was the restoration of vital godliness as over against dead formality in religion. It was brought about by the instauration of two fundamental Lutheran principles—true repentance and the personal experience of salvation, which Wesley was enabled to understand only after he had read the writings of Luther, notably his Preface to Romans. And when in 1817 Harms broke the power of rationalism and

---

*The constant exclamation of the Reformers was, *Nihil novi*—we have brought in nothing new. That they were sincere, the facts themselves testify. They accepted without reserve the doctrines of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, because these were the doctrines of Paul and Peter and John. "In Christianity there can be nothing concerning truth which is not ancient; and whatsoever is truly new, is certainly false."—*Pearson on the Creed, Epistle Dedicatory.*

†See *Kurtz's Pietism.*

gave back an evangelical faith to Germany, he did it by preaching a sermon on the fourth article of the Augustana.

In each and every case the appeal was to the word of God; but not to the word of God according to any private interpretation; but to the word of God as the Holy Ghost had expounded it to the consciousness of the witnessing and confessing Church. Certainly the duty of the preacher is to preach the word; but he preaches the word best and with best effect who holds on with tightest grasp to the ancient faith of the Church, but makes it tingle with the life of the present hour. "Look then to the fountain, and strive to embrace the first faith, to which you cannot have a more probable guide than the Creed, received in all ages of the Church; and to this I refer you, as it leads you to the Scriptures, from whence it was at first deduced, that while 'those which are unskilful and unstable wrest' the words of God himself 'unto their own damnation,' ye may receive so much instruction as may set you beyond the imputation of unskilfulness, and so much of confirmation as may place you out of the danger of instability."*

## II. THE END OF CHRISTIAN PREACHING.

In Romans 10 : 13–17, the apostle writes, "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? * * So then faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of Christ." Herein is stated the necessity of the official bearers and messengers of God's word. The "hearing" of the seventeenth verse is the message† sent from God, and has its authority from the command (ῥῆμα) of Christ; that is, Christ appoints and commands men to deliver his message to the people, that through this message they may receive and exercise faith. This shows that the end of Christian preaching is faith in the hearer. God has appointed it as an instrumentality for setting forth the things of

---

**Pearson as above.*

†See Lange's Com. *in loco;* also Robinson's N. T. Lexicon under ἀκοή.

Christ. These things heard as a divine message become the objective points on which faith so fixes herself as to bring Christ a present personal Saviour into the heart as the object of faith. For it hath pleased God by the foolishness of the preaching (better, *the thing preached*) to save them that believe. Thus salvation comes by believing; and believing by hearing,* and hearing by preaching, which is the setting forth or heralding of Christ and of the things of Christ with reference to faith in them. Hence the end of Christian preaching is not the delight of the fancy, nor the enlargement of the reason, nor the expansion of the intellect, nor the enkindling of the imagination; but *faith in Christ as a personal Saviour and Redeemer.* He who preaches with any other end in view, prostitutes his divine calling, feeds the people on colocynths and gourds, and not on the sincere milk and strong meat, and regales them with gay tulips and daffodils, and not with the rose of sharon and the lily of the valley; yea, leads thirsting souls to stagnant pools and not to fountains of living waters.† And he who turns the things heard (the message) to any other end than faith in Christ, in so far, by his impenitence and hardness of heart, defeats the end of preaching, and opposes the will and authority of God, for the things heard are the sacred things of the divine word, which authoritatively declares the grace of God and the willingness and power of Christ to save, and hence becomes a savor of life unto life to them that believe, and is "veiled only to them that are perishing: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving."

But it must be understood that Christian preaching is simply the means of getting the message of salvation before the hearers. Hence it is not a cause; nor is it an end in itself; nor does it have any merit, except as its does its work faithfully and well, and brings the message home with unction and convincing power to the heart of the hearer. But as faith is as well the voluntary choice of the hearer as it is the gift of God, no preaching can compel faith. It simply throws the responsibility of

---

*See Robinson as above.

†See Jeremy Taylor's Sermon on The Minister's Duty in Life and Doctrine.

accepting or rejecting Christ upon the hearer. When the message is heard with obedience, that is, with a sincere desire to know the truth and a willingness to do it, it then becomes the power of God unto salvation—the one chosen strong instrumentality for awakening and strengthening faith, and for building up an abiding fellowship in the Lord Jesus, and for extending the Redeemer's kingdom to the ends of the earth. As we look at it in history and as we regard it to-day, we find it is exactly that instrument which God is using for overthrowing all the false faith of the world, and for enthroning the Lord Jesus Christ King of the nations of the earth. In the eyes of men, it may appear very weakness and foolishness; but it is one of those foolish things which God uses to confound the wise, and one of those weak things by which he brings to naught the things that are strong, that the excellence of the power might be of God and not of men. In the multiplied variety of human conditions and of moral susceptibilities, it may fall on hearts as hard as the the nether millstone, or on hearts drowned in the cares of this world. To these it will be a savor of death unto death. But it will also fall on hearts which hear and understand the word. To these it will be a savor of life unto life. As the rain cometh down from heaven and watereth the place beneath, so the word of God which we preach. It shall not return void. It shall accomplish that whereunto it hath been sent. It shall publish God's grace to the ends of the earth, and be the means of leading millions of men to faith in the world's Redeemer, "for faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of Christ." As the word is energetically preached with long-suffering and forbearance, men will see Jesus, and will lay hold of him with the heart, and will "grow up in all things into him which is the head."

# ARTICLE VIII.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

### AMERICAN.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Sermons on the Christian Life*, by J. De Witt, D. D. *Metaphors in the Gospels*, a series of short studies, by Donald Fraser. *The Hebrew Feasts in their Relation to recent Critical Hypotheses Concerning the Pentateuch*, (the Newton Lectures for 1885), by Dr. H. W. Green. *Lectures on the Epistles for Sundays and the Chief Festivals*, by Rev. Jos. A. Seiss, D. D. *A Layman's Study of the English Bible*, by Prof. Francis Bowen. *Parables of the Lake*, by J. R. Macduff, D. D. *The Idea of God* as affected by modern knowledge, by John Fiske. *The Lord's Day;* its universal and perpetual obligation. A Premium Essay, by A. E. Waffle. *Our Parish Church*, twenty addresses to children on great truths of the Christian Faith, by Rev. S. Baring-Gould. *Religion in History and in the Life of To-day*, by A. M. Fairbairn, D. D. *Natural Theology;* or Rational Theism, by M. Valentine, D. D. *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, by Emil Schurer, D. D., M. A. *Expository Sermons and Outlines* on the Old Testament, by various famous English Clergymen—a vol. of the "Clerical Library."

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*The Stars and Constellations*, by Royal Hill. *Anthropoid Apes*, by Rob. Hartmann, Prof. in the University of Berlin. *The Insuppressible Book*, a controversy between Herbert Spencer and Frederick Harrison, with comments by Gail Hamilton.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*The Story of Rome* from the Earliest Times to the end of the Republic, by Arthur Gilman. *Paris in Old and Present Times*, with especial reference to changes in its architecture and topography, by Philip Gilbert Hamerton. *Incidents and Anecdotes of the Civil War*, by Admiral D. D. Porter. *The Fall of Constantinople*, being the story of the Fourth Crusade, by Edwin Pears. *Egypt, Past and Present*, described and illustrated, with a narrative of its occupation by the British and of recent events in the Soudan, by H. W. Adams. *The Greek Islands and Turkey After the War*, by H. M. Field.

POETRY AND CRITICISM.—*From Shakespeare to Pope*, an inquiry into the causes and phenomena of the rise of classical poetry in England, by Edmund Gosse. *Poets of America*, by Edmund C. Stedman.

### GERMAN.

THEOLOGICAL.—*System der Christlichen Wahrheit.* Dr. F. H. R. Frank. I. Halfte. 2. Aufl. pp. 525. Erlangen, 1885. It is a happy

index of the present trend of German theology that this thoroughly Lutheran work appears so early in a second edition. *Das geistliche Priesterthum der Christen.* Prof. Dr. P. Madsen. In autorisirter deutscher Uebersetzung von Past. E. Schumacher. pp. 154. Gütersloh, 1882. Die Christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung. Albr. Ritschl. 2. Verb. Aufl. 3. Bd. Die Positive Entwickelung der Lehre. pp. 628. Bonn, 1883. *Hagenbach's, K. R. Encyclopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften.* 11. Aufl., durchgängich revidirt, ergänzt und hrsg. von Prof. E. Kautsch. pp. 544. Leipsic, 1884.

BIBLICAL.—Part I. of the second volume of Köhler's *Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte.* pp. 473. Erlangen, 1884. It extends to the division of the kingdom and is a contribution to Old Testament studies of great merit. *Die Psalmen,* aus dem Grundtexte übersetzt und durch eine fortlaufende Besprechung erläutert. Lic. Dr. H. V. Andreae. pp. 580. Frankfort a. M., 1885. A work of popular and devotional interest rather than of critical value. *Die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte.* Aug. Jacobsen. pp. 26. Berlin, 1885. *Die deutsche Bibelübersetzung* der mittelalterlichen Waldenser in dem Codex Teplensis und der ersten gedruckten deutschen Bibel nachgewissen. Dr. Herm. Haupt. pp. 64. Würzburg, 1885. This work has excited the attention of scholars by the proofs it furnishes that the pre-Luther German translations of the Bible were primarily the work of the heretical Waldenses, and that they sustain a close relation to the Romanic translations. *Letzte Bibelstudien.* Prof. Dr. Herm. Gust. Hoelemann. pp. 595. Leipsic, 1885. "The author understands how to make a masterly and conscientious application of the ripe fruits of his exegetical labors to the interests of practical life." *Lehrbuch der historisch-Kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* Dr. Heinr. Jul. Holtzmann. pp. 504. Freiburg i. Br., 1885. *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament.* Dr. H. A. W. Meyer. 1. Abth., 2. Hälfte. Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas. 7. Aufl. Revised by Prof. Dr. Bernh. Weiss. pp. 654. Göttingen, 1885.

HISTORICAL.—A third and thoroughly revised edition of Lechler's great work *Das apostolische und nachapostolische Zeitalter* m. Rücksicht Auf Unterscheid u. Einheit in Leben und Lehre. pp. 635. Carlsruhe, 1885. *Cyprian von Karthago und die Verfassung der Kirche.* Privatdoc. Lic. Otto Ritschl. Eine Kirchengeshichtliche und kirchenrechtliche Untersuchung. pp. 250. Göttingen, 1885. *Geschichte des Alterthums.* I. Bd. Geschichte des Orients bis Zur Begründung des Perserreichs. Edward Meyer. pp. 647. Stuttgart, 1884. *Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien.* In ihrem Zusammenhange dargestellt. Staatsarchivar Dr. Ludw. Keller. pp. 516. Leipsic, 1885. A book offering much valuable material but greatly marred by its manifest prepossessions in favor of the Anabaptists. *Indogermanischer*

*Volkesglaube.* Ein Beitrag Zur Religionsgeschichte der Urzeit. Prof. Dr. W. Schwartz. pp. xxiv., 280. Berlin, 1885. *Die Christliche Liebesthätigkeit.* 2. Bd. Das Mittelalter. Abt Dr. G. Uhlhorn. It is hoped that this second volume of a most excellent work, will soon, like the first volume, find a good translator. *Luther als Katechet.* Prof. Dr. Johs. Gottschick. pp. 42. Giessen, 1883. *Geschichte des Pietismus.* II. Bd. Der Pietismus in der lutherischen Kirche des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts. I. Abth. Alb. Ritschl. pp. 590. Bonn, 1884. *Ueber das Verhältniss der Alten Philosophie Zum Christethum.* Dr. Karl F. A. Kahnis. pp. 84. Leipsic, 1884. *Handbuch der kirchlichen Kunst-Archæologie des deutschen Mittelalters.* 5. Aufl. 2 Bde. D. Heinr. Otte. pp. 607, 855. Leipsic, 1884. *Ursprung und Wesen des Pietismus.* Prof. Eug. Sachsse. pp. 382. Wiesbaden, 1884. *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche* bis zu ihrer Pflanzung auf deutschem Boden. Ob.-Konsist. Rath. Dr. Burk. pp. 337. Stuttgart, 1885. *Lucas Cranach.* Ein Lebensbild aus dem Zeitalter der Reformation. M. B. Lindau. pp. 402. Leipsic, 1883. *Samuel Gobat, evangelischer Bischof von Jerusalem.* Sein Leben und Wirken meist nach seinen eigenen Aufzeichnungen. pp. 550. Basel, 1884. *Das Leben D. Friedrich August Gotttreu Tholuck's.* Prof. Supt. Leop. Witte. I. Bd. 1799–1826. pp. 478. Bielefeld, 1884. *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* bis zum Augsburger Religionsfrieden. Karl Wilh. Nitzsch. 3. Bd. Vom Tode Heinrichs VI. bis zum Augsburger Religionsfrieden. pp. 458. Leipsic, 1885.

HOMILETICAL.—*Zu Jesu Füssen.* 25 Predigten aus der Schleswiger Amtszeit. Past. A. v. Broecker. pp. 288. Schleswig, 1884. *Letzte Predigten,* nach der Feier seiner 25 jährigen Amtsführung als Pastor zu St. Nicolai in Leipzig gehalten. Dr. Fr. Ahlfeld. 2. Thl. Neunzehn Predigten. 1879–1881. pp. 333. Leipsic, 1885. A more eloquent preacher of the Gospel than Ahlfeld has not arisen in Germany for a generation. *Sechs Predigten* J. Bugenhagens, Aufgefunden u. mitgetheilt v. G. Buchwald. pp. 31. Halle, 1885. *Himmelan!* Ein Jahrgang Evangelienpredigten aus Würtemberg. Gust. Gerok, in Verbindung mit vielen Geistlichen hrsg. pp. 545. Stuttgart, 1884. *Florenzer Predigten.* Lic. Dr. Georg Loesche. pp. 88. Halle, 1884.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Sittliche Fragen.* Ethisches und Apologetisches über Freiheit, Gewissen und Sittengesetz. Gymn. Prof. Dr. Rud. Kittel. pp. 230. Stuttgart, 1885. *Die Welt des Glaubens u. die Alltagswelt.* Dargelegt nach den Fusstapfen Abrahams. Past. O. Funcke. pp. 411. Bremen, 1885. The third and enlarged edition of *Das deutsche evangelische Pfarrhaus,* Seine Gründung, seine Entfaltungund sein Bestand. Gen. Supt. Dr. Wilhelm Baur. pp. 507. Bremen, 1884. *Ein Flüchtling* der St. Bartholomäusnacht. Pfr. G. F. Ochsenbein. pp. 80. Berne, 1885. *Verhandlungen des XXIII. Kongresses für in-*

*nere Mission* zu Karlsruhe vom 23. bis 25. Sept., 1884. pp. 200. Frankfort a. M., 1884. *Darstellung und Kritik der Grundsätze des Materialismus.* Herm. Stüven. Ein Beitrag zur Bewahrung und Erneuerung des deutschen Geisteslebens. pp. 55. Hamburg, 1885.

---

# ARTICLE IX.

## NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

S. C. GRIGGS & COMPANY, CHICAGO.

*Natural Theology;* or Rational Theism. By M. Valentine, D. D., Ex-President of Pennsylvania College, and Professor of Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa. pp. 274. 1885.

The accomplished author of this volume on the theistic evidences requires no introduction to the readers of the QUARTERLY. His lucid treatment of every subject touched by his pen, his graceful style, his logical force and the uniform thoroughness of all his productions are merits which in their minds have for years been associated with his name. Even the contents of the present work are not unfamiliar to many of them, as they present the substance of his lectures on the subject, which were annually delivered to the Seniors during his incumbency of the President's chair in Pennsylvania College. They will rejoice with the writer that these admirable lectures have now been given to the public in a permanent form, and that the reception which the press has given the work augurs for it a wide circulation and a lasting fame.

The difficulties which surround this momentous subject, and the profound and staggering metaphysics which underlie it, may readily be inferred from the fact that although forming an indispensable part of every college curriculum, no suitable text-book has thus far made its appearance. Our educational institutions have been waiting for just such a work, and it is destined as it is notably adapted to become, the standard manual on Rational Theism. It reminds one constantly of Butler's *Analogy*, not only in the subject treated, but in the learning, conciseness and force of the argument. Like the *Analogy* it is not designed for a leisure hour, to help the time to pass away, nor can it be read by snatches and occasional chapters. Each position is made to rest upon another, and the entire structure of the discussion is so compactly put together that a study of the whole becomes necessary in order to appreciate any one point. The product of many years of hard thinking, it is one of the greatest merits of such a work that it promotes hard thinking. It is a stimulus to energetic mental application. Our minds are prone to sluggishness, thought is labor, and whether from indolence

or weakness, we decline that severer intellectual exertion by which alone the mind can be properly disciplined and invigorated. A treatise like the present, traversing a subject of sublime import, possessing the charm which always inheres in a profound problem when lucidly presented, and proceeding from an author whose ability and scholarship are unsurpassed in the Lutheran Church, will impel many to lay aside their shallow books and magazines and take up afresh a study that offers unspeakable benefits both to mind and heart. Dr. V. will undoubtedly have his reward in the gratitude of many of the best minds of the country for this unequaled compendium of the theistic argument, and especially in the thankful appreciation of his denomination, upon which authorship of this quality sheds a rare lustre. W.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON.

For Sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

*The Holy Bible*, Containing the Old and New Testaments, translated out of the Original Tongues: being the version set forth A. D. 1611, commonly called King James' Version; arranged in parallel columns with the Revised Version of 1881 and 1885. pp. xv., 1304, and x., 408.

This is "The Riverside Parallel Bible," a royal octavo, gotten out with great neatness and taste, the most attractive issue we have yet seen of the version of 1611 combined with the recently revised version. The left-hand column contains the text of the Authorized Version as usually printed, the copy followed being that of the Oxford edition of 1885, with the references to other passages of Scripture, but without the marginal readings. The right-hand column contains the Revised Version; the marginal readings are placed at the foot of the page, and indicated by letters corresponding to the superior letters in the text. The address to the reader prefixed to the King James Version, the Prefaces of the Revisers, the names of the Revisers of both British and American companies, and the lists of renderings preferred by the American Committee are also included in this volume.

This is not the place to discuss the merits of the Revised Version. To do this would require more space than is here at our command. The judgment of criticism is properly crediting the work of the Old Testament revision a superiority to that of the New—mainly in the fewer unnecessary changes made, and in a purer, more idiomatic English. Undoubtedly, too, the revised version of both the Old and New presents the results of such high scholarly labor in the endeavor to give a correct translation of the word of God, that all persons need to possess it. For convenience, for fulness of reference and indications, and for neat and inviting pages for comparison of the two versions, the edition before us deserves high recommendation. It is printed with the characteristic taste which marks the work of "The Riverside Press."

*The Idea of God as Affected by Modern Knowledge.* By John Fiske. pp. 173. 1886.

This small work is a sequel to "The Destiny of Man, viewed in the Light of his Origin," and meant to complete the author's view of man and the universe. Prof. Fiske believes that modern knowledge, especially the evolutionary origin of the universe and man according to Darwin and Spencer, which he regards as established beyond controversy, requires a thorough change in the idea of God and a new form of theism. The transcendent and anthropomorphic God, heretofore worshiped under the view of Him as the Creator, is to be replaced by a conception of Him as the immanent eternal Energy, the internal life of the world. The word Force, taken from the language of physics, Prof. Fiske uses as a "symbol" of the "eternal Power which is always and every where manifested in phenomena." This power is not to be thought of as material, but rather psychical, because according to idealism, which the author holds to be the true philosophy, we do not know of any real existence but that psychical being which appears in personal consciousness. This eternal Reality must therefore, he claims, be expressed in terms of the only reality that we know. Thus this Power, symbolized by the "Force" animating the universe as a living organism, is called God, and conceived of as psychical rather than material.

The evolutionist theism rejects absolutely the whole idea of "secondary causes." It knows nothing of physical causation save as immediate manifestation of the one omnipresent Power. "The infinite and eternal power that is manifested in every pulsation of the universe is none other than the living God." One cannot read this little volume, so full of the graces of finest rhetoric, without recognizing that while the author is dealing here and there a just stroke on some mistaken notions about God and His relation to the world, he has only succeeded in establishing his new conception of deity by personifying the "force" manifested in the world-phenomena, and identifying it as God. The result is evolutionary pantheism.

*Observations on the Growth of the Mind.* By Sampson Reed. New Edition with a Biographical Preface by James Reed. pp. 111.

This small volume was first published in Boston about forty years ago. It has occasionally been out of print. Its author was a graduate of Harvard in 1814, and studied theology in the Divinity School at Cambridge. He became while there a thorough believer in the doctrinal system of Swedenborg. Debarred, in consequence, of preaching in the connection in which he originally looked to the ministry, he turned to business and became a druggist in Boston. He wrote for several journals. At the age of twenty-six he published this little book. Emerson was greatly pleased with it and called the attention of his friends to it, and sent it to Carlyle. Carlyle was very laudatory of it.

The aim of the book is to trace in brief way the divine order arranged by God for the development of the mental life and the right high manhood of men, through both the activity of their own minds and the work of life according to God's truth in the Scriptures and in nature. The range of discussion is apart from distinct statement of Swedenborgian tenets. Only their coloring here and there appears. It deals with profound truths in human nature—some of them penetrating to the deepest philosophy of character and welfare. It abounds in gems of fine thought. Such thoughts as these our orthodox piety need not fear, as they fit our teaching better than that with which they here happen to be put.

*Poets of America.* By Edmund Clarence Stedman, author of "Victorian Poets." pp. 516. 1885.

Mr. Stedman has made himself favorably and widely known by his literary criticism in a number of works, particularly his "Victorian Poets." That work forms a critical survey of the poets and poetry of England from the beginning of the present reign, and has become to some extent a critical handbook and means of reference. The aim of the author in the volume before us has been to furnish a similar critical view of the poets and poetry of our own country—a work contemplated even in that preliminary and preparatory effort. It affords a general view of the poetic development from the beginning to the present date.

The first and second chapters treat, in an interesting way, of the Early and Recent Conditions of poetry in our country, and the Growth of an American School, followed by chapters on Bryant, Whittier, Emerson, Longfellow, Poe, Holmes, Lowell, Walt Whitman, and Bayard Taylor, with a chapter on the outlook. These criticisms are sympathetic and discriminating. The author reveals fine literary insight and appreciation, and felicitous aptness of expression in bringing out the subtler qualities of poetic excellence. We are not sure that his praise of Whitman, however, does not cover a slight sense of inadequate ground for its bestowment.

*General History of the Christian Religion and Church.* From the German of Dr. Augustus Neander. Translated according to the latest Edition, by Joseph Torrey, Professor in the University of Vermont. Thirteenth American Edition. Revised, Corrected and Enlarged. In Six Volumes, 8vo., including an Index Volume, comprising altogether 3524 pp. With Portrait. The set, with Index, $20.00 net. The Index Volume, separately, $3.00 net.

The body of the readers of the QUARTERLY require at this date no introduction to Neander's History of the Christian Religion and Church. Yet it may not be untimely to remind them that with all the enrichment of this branch of science from year to year, this monument

of genius, learning and faith still continues without a rival. One of his most distinguished pupils, the Rev. Dr. Schaff, whose own massive History is second only to that of the "Father of Church History," pronounces it "the most original phenomenon in the literary world of the nineteenth century," and says that "Neander still remains beyond doubt the greatest Church historian."

Nor can attention be directed too often to the chief peculiarity and crowning excellence of Neander. To speak of his work as an immense treasure-house of erudition would convey a very inadequate notion of its pre-eminent merit. Intellectual treasures may be dry, cold and lifeless, whereas one feels throughout these volumes the throbbing of an intense life, and the reader is held as by a spell in the midst of moving activities and living actors clothed with flesh and aglow with spiritual energy. As indicated by the title, this is a History of the Christian Religion as well as of the Church. Making the renewed heart the proper organ for theology and enjoying within himself the experience of the life of Christ, Neander keenly recognized the "operating principle" within the Church, and he is ever bringing into view this inner vital force. To him the Church is the life of Christ perpetuating itself by interpenetrating the life of humanity. It represents the process of the divine leaven pervading and transforming the lives of individuals and communities. Special prominence is given to biographical sketches of eminent and saintly men. With a passionate love for such individuals he lays bare their inward spiritual character as illustrating the hidden presence and power of Christ in the heart. Thus this colossal work of science is made to serve the purposes of imparting edification as well as instruction, and that potent spiritual influence which the author exercised over his students in the lecture room is destined to be a perpetual stimulus to faith, an unfailing quickener of spiritual energy among his many thousand readers in Europe and America.

Besides the copious index which accompanies each volume, the liberal publishers have in their latest edition added a separate index volume of 239 pages, which is the most complete example of the kind known to the writer. It includes not only the general contents of the five large volumes, but an analytical list of the citations from Christian and pagan authors found in the notes, as well as the citations from Scripture scattered through the work. Many of these citations are from works not to be found in this country, thus not only introducing the reader to the great writers on theology and to many of the records of the Christian Church, not otherwise accessible to him, but by the careful classification of the passages cited, under the names of the authors and their works, giving him an invaluable opportunity of knowing the tenor of their writings and the views they entertain. Houghton & Co's edition of this work is brought out in a solid and splendid style, and no library can be regarded complete without it.

*Eight Studies on the Lord's Day.* pp. 292. 1885.

A rare combination of genius and modesty led the unknown author of this work to present it anonymously to a considerable number of Christian scholars. Their judgment was so emphatic in its recognition of the worth of the volume, that the publishers, having secured the author's consent, resolved to offer the book to the public through the ordinary channels of trade. It is the freshest and by much the strongest treatise on this great practical theme, known to the writer. Its argument for the divine Institution of the Lord's Day is invincible. The discussion is not controversial, deals in no hackneyed platitudes, has nothing to say about the attitude of the Reformers and makes but a single passing allusion to the Puritan Sabbath. It claims to aim rather at pointing out methods of inquiry than at establishing results, but this aim is followed with such cleverness that the results are inevitable.

We hope and we predict that these "Eight Studies" will become a standard on the subject which they treat so clearly, so thoroughly, and so completely in accord with Scripture and with reason.

HARPER & BROTHERS, FRANKLIN SQUARE, NEW YORK.

*The Land and the Book;* or Biblical Illustrations drawn from the Manners and Customs, the Scenes and Scenery of the Holy Land.

*Lebanon, Damascus and Beyond Jordan.* By William M. Thomson, D. D., Forty-five years a Missionary in Syria and Palestine. 147 Illustrations and Maps. pp. 711. 1886.

The two previous volumes of this magnificent work—"Southern Palestine and Jerusalem" and "Central Palestine and Phœnicia" were mainly devoted to the Promised Land west of the Jordan. The present volume, which completes the series, relates to Lebanon, Damascus, Bashan, Gilead and the regions "beyond Jordan eastward," countries which though not an integral part of the Holy Land, were closely connected with it, were among the first occupied by the patriarchs, or taken possession of by the nation, and all most intimately associated with the Israelites in their social, civil and religious institutions, and in their secular history. All who take an interest in the study of the geography and natural productions, manners and customs, scenery and scenes of "The Land and the Book," will find in these three royal volumes, aggregating 2000 pages, a complete library upon the subject. They leave nothing to be desired. They contain not only the observations of the author who has spent half a century in exploring the localities and noting the points of interest hallowed by association with the history of salvation, but also the most valuable archæological researches of the American Palestine Exploration Society and the Palestine Exploration Fund of England, besides many important and interesting observations derived from the publications of eminent writers and travelers who have recently visited these countries.

Bible students can never forget the measure of obligation under which they are placed to Dr. Thomson by his painstaking examinations, his enthusiastic and picturesque descriptions and the judicious and satisfactory elucidation of many Scripture passages which this work offers. And many who have yearned, but without hope, that they might some day visit the blessed scenes of the Land of Promise, will rejoice that through the eyes of the author and by means of his graphic and faithful pen and the splendid pictorial illustrations which adorn these volumes, they may in their homes traverse the country from Dan to Beersheba and from the Mediterranean eastward far beyond the Jordan, and view the scenes of sacred story with a degree of pleasure and of profit which could scarcely be equaled by a personal tour extending over many years. As we pore over these lively pages and study these scenic views the Holy Land is not afar off, and to us inaccesible, but right before our eyes is expanded "the Canaan that we love," and we seem to be moving over the very soil trodden by the feet of the Divine and sailing over the waters that became calm before his voice and firm underneath his feet.

*The Holy Bible.* Containing the Old and New Testaments translated out of the Original Tongues; being the Version set forth A. D. 1611, compared with the Most Ancient Authorities and Revised.

This edition of the Revised Version has about 450 pages of quarto size, and includes the prefaces of the revision committee. It is printed in the excellent style that characterizes the books and periodicals of the Harpers, and, while the type is not large, the page is very attractive and distinct. As an edition containing the Revised Version alone, it is very desirable.

*Beyond the Grave.* By Dr. Hermann Cremer, Professor of Theology in the University of Greifswald. Translated from the German by the Rev. Samuel T. Lowrie, D. D. With an Introduction by the Rev. A. A. Hodge, D. D., of Princeton Theological Seminary. pp. 149. 1886.

An excellent little volume on a dark but most interesting problem which only God's word can solve, and which is treated here by an eminent student of God's word both with reverence and devout loyalty to revealed truth.

*Strange Stories From History* for Young People. By George Cary Eggleston, Author of "Red Eagle," "The Signal Boys," &c. Illustrated. pp. 243. 1886.

Most of these stories appeared originally in "Harper's Young People." They are "strange" not in the sense of being marvelous or weird, but because they are unfamiliar to youthful readers and most of them relate deeds and occurrences somewhat out of the common. They are told in a sprightly manner and will be read with avidity and profit by the young.

FUNK & WAGNALLS, NEW YORK.

*Daniel the Prophet.* Nine Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford. With copious notes by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church. pp. 519, 8vo. 1885. (*Bible Student's Library*).

Any work of ability bearing on this important and much assailed book of the Bible is to be heartily welcomed by the theological world. Our English literature upon it has been deplorably meagre and unsatisfactory. This reprint of Pusey is especially valuable. Called forth by the tide of British skepticism which some years ago was let loose upon the young and uninstructed, these lectures were primarily intended for the defense of the faith and the author's fervent devotion to the truth glows upon every page. The student will find quite a contrast with the cold, critical and spiritless exposition which characterizes so many of the modern famous commentaries. While no less scholarly or instructive or helpful in the solution of the difficult problems connected with this prophetical book, Dr. Pusey's work offers something to the heart as well as to the head.

His expositions reveal a childlike simplicity that often remind one of Luther's exegetical temper. He treats the sacred page like a learner rather than as a master. As a distinguished divine cleverly puts it: "He seems to be on his knees as he studies—seeking only to know God's meaning and desiring to do only God's will."

Besides the body of the "Lectures" the volume abounds in learned and critical notes, while the Preface must prove most refreshing and reassuring to all intelligent minds that have felt the force of Rationalistic attacks on God's Revelation. Pusey's High Church and Tractarian views are not even remotely broached in this volume. He is contending here against other foes than those which confronted him in the Anglo-Catholic movement and he confines himself to the definite issue of maintaining the genuineness and authenticity of the Book of Daniel.

*The Minor Prophets*, with a Commentary, Explanatory and Practical, and Introduction to the several Books. By the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ's Church. Vol. II. Micah, Nahum, Habakuk, Haggai, Zephaniah, Zechariah and Malachi.

The words of welcome with which we greeted the appearance of the first volume of Dr. Pusey's Minor Prophets, we can with equal justice and pleasure accord to the second also. Its merits and popularity entitle it to the rank of a standard work. Although its leading object is not so much the critical examination and explanation of these books merely for the sake of criticism, and it is thus not in its principal features a book for scholars exclusively or chiefly, but has rather the practical aim of drawing from the minor prophets the wealth of revealed truth in a

form and shape best calculated to help the minister in his pulpit work, the Sunday-school superintendent and teachers in their preparations and other intelligent laymen in their private study of God's word, it is very apparent to the close and observing reader that back of these more practical features lies a deep and thorough knowledge and appreciation of all that the best of modern criticism has been able to bring to bear on the interpretation of the minor prophets. It is not by any means a superficial work, even if it is rather practical in purpose, as is evident from the critical notes appended to nearly every page. The only possible objection a reader could urge against the book is the rather arbitrary assigning of one page of explanation to every two or three verses of the text. We think that in many cases these two or three verses could have been disposed of in half a column, while in other cases six or seven pages of exegesis would not have been too many. But even as matters stand, we know of no exegetical handbook on any portion of the Bible that can with better confidence be recommended to pastors, teachers and other learners of divine truth for constant study and reference. G. H. S.

*Thirty Thousand Thoughts.* Being Extracts covering a Comprehensive Circle of Religious and Allied Topics. Edited by Revs. Canon H. D. M. Spence, M. A., Joseph S. Exell, M. A., Charles Neil, M. A. Vol. IV. pp. 523.

Here we have another volume of this comprehensive and valuable work. It contains chapters xii, xiii, xiv, and xv, the first being devoted to "Jehovistic Names and Titles of God," the second to "The Attributes of God," the third to "Sins," and the last to "Christian Dogmatics." The material is "gathered from the best available sources of all ages and all schools of thought," the whole classified on a scientific basis and made convenient for reference and consultation.

This work, when finished, will be a rich repository of religious and theological literature—more complete than any private library and more systematically arranged. The fourth volume closes with the 13420th thought, so that the publishers have nearly reached the half-way post. It is a great work, and the volume before us is surpassed by none of the preceding. We are ready to reiterate what we have said in previous notices.

*Apostolic Life*, as revealed in the Acts of the Apostles. By Joseph Parker, D. D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London. Author of "Ecce Deus," "The Paraclete," "The Priesthood of Christ," "The Inner Life of Christ," "The Ark of God," etc. Vol. III. pp. 357.

This volume completes Dr. Parker's sermons on "Apostolic Life." It begins with the twentieth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. The

author's reputation for vividness and suggestiveness of style is well sustained by this volume. He is, moreover, very happy in the titles given to the sermons and shows remarkable versatility in the prayers which respectively precede the sermons. His language is rich in rhetorical figures and in striking and poetic turns of thought. There are here forty-one sermons besides the prayers, a fair sized octavo volume, and yet the publishers have issued it at the low sum of $1.50.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

For Sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co. Phila.

*A Layman's Study of the English Bible*, considered in its Literary and Secular Aspect. By Francis Bowen, LL. D., Alford Professor of Philosophy in Harvard College. pp 145.

Leaving out of view, for the time, the relation of the Scriptures to religion and theology, the distinguished author of this small volume seeks to treat the Bible simply as an "English Classic." Looking on the books which compose the Bible as "containing a body of history, poetry and philosophy, the study of which has done more than any other single cause to modify the course and happiness of thinking men on the earth, and to color and direct the whole course of modern civilization," he holds that the study of the Bible is of essential value in right education.

Prof. Bowen, after the introductory chapter, treats of The Narratives of the Old Testament, The Parables of our Lord, The Gospel Narrative, The Philosophy of the Bible, The Poetry of the Bible, The History Contained in the Bible, and The Character and Institutions of Moses. The literary qualities of the Scripture writings are indicated with clearness and force. Though Prof. Bowen, in his plan, disowns any purpose to treat of its religious relation, he has yet allowed himself to bring out his views pretty fully about the questions of revelation, inspiration, divine authority, and other topics which are agitating the theology of the day. In his conception of it, the Bible being simply the collected literature of the Jews, *is* not a revelation from God, but may be said, in a sense, to *contain* a revelation—rather, a series of revelations, the patriarchal, the Jewish, and the Christian. These revelations, with their primary theistic and ethical truths are to be *searched out and discriminated*, by our reason and moral sense, from the whole mass of this national literature, from the legendary stories and fictions in which they are imbedded. His whole handling is on the conception that the Bible is the collected body of the Jewish literature, through which there runs a divine teaching with which the various writers have mixed many legends and much private matter.

Even on this low view of it, the author brings to view a surpassing work and glory in the Bible. Though he accounts it nothing more, he shows that it has given to the world the best things the world has, its

only correct theism, the true divine laws of ethical life, the only regenerating truth for man. It is to be regretted, however, that Prof. Bowen, while claiming to discuss the literary and secular worth of the Sacred Scriptures, has adopted a treatment which tends to break down the unwary reader's faith in their full divine authority. Apart from this the discussion is full of interest, richly suggestive and abounding in eloquent passages. It must be confessed, however, that the literary quality of this work is not equal to Prof. Bowen's best. It bears marks of hasty or careless composition.

*Christ and Christianity* Studies on Christology, Creeds and Confessions, Protestantism and Romanism, Reformation Principles, Sunday Observance, Religious Freedom, and Christian Union. By Philip Schaff. pp. 310. 1885.

Quite a number of the papers which constitute these "studies" have already appeared, being printed papers or published addresses delivered on various occasions. Among these are the author's inaugural address as Professor in the Union Theological Seminary; his address before the students on the fourth centennial of Luther's Birth; the "Consensus of the Reformed Confessions" read at the First General Presbyterian Council in Edinburgh, 1877; the essay on the Christian Sabbath at the National Sabbath Convention at Saratoga, N. Y., 1863; The Development of Religious Freedom, and "the Discord and Concord of Christendom." Other "studies" are "Christ His own best Witness," "Creeds and Confessions," "Slavery and the Bible," etc. The longest discussion is that on "Christ in Theology," tracing the doctrine of Christ's Person in the Creeds and Confessions of the Church, and its development and modifications in modern dogmatics. They are interesting and valuable papers, and the author has done well to bring them together in permanent form. The views presented throughout are, of course, from the Reformed or Calvinistic standpoint. Dr. Schaff is broad and catholic in his temper, and seems disposed, indeed, to be fair in his representations of Lutheran theology, but his personal sympathies necessarily affect the comparative view. The volume deserves to be welcomed as containing the mature views of its eminent author on the various doctrinal and practical questions of which it treats.

*Sermons on the Christian Life.* By John De Witt, D. D., Professor of Church History, Lane Theological Seminary. pp. 420.

Here are twenty-seven sermons—all of decided merit though differing somewhat in degree. They are of an eminently practical character with a good sub-stratum of doctrine underlying them, thus making what we conceive to be the right kind of sermon. The author, in his preface, makes a *quasi* apology because the style and language of his sermons often border on familiar conversation, and explains it by saying

that "a preacher feels that he is at liberty to indulge in abrupt turns of speech, in sentences rhetorically incomplete, and in repetitions which, in an essay, would be out of place." No necessity for an apology here. It is one of the merits of the sermons that they are not like essays, but that they have been prepared on the principle that "the form of the sermon is determined by the relations of the preacher to his audience quite as much as it is by his theme." Quite true; and it would be well if all sermons were less essay-like and more adapted to the relations between pastor and people. The title of these sermons shows that they were intended to promote the growth of the Christian in spiritual life. They are well adapted for that purpose and will prove profitable to every reader.

D. APPLETON & CO., NEW YORK.

*A History of the United States*, from the Revolution to the Civil War. By John Bach McMaster, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. In five volumes. Vol. II. pp. 656.

This volume embraces the period of our history from 1790 to 1803—years full of interest and fraught with measures and events deeply affecting the welfare of our people and government. The first volume of this elaborate work was noticed in the QUARTERLY of July, 1883, and we are still further impressed by this volume with the merits then noticed. Among other things we then said: "The reader immediately feels the charms of its bright pages of closely marshalled facts and picturesque style. He finds his attention at once awakened by a fresh view of the history and progress of our country, and his interest held by the graphic and vigorous delineation with which the account proceeds. * * The scope of Prof. McMaster's plan is similar to that so successfully pursued by Mr. Green in his exceedingly popular 'History of the English People.' It leaves the common track of narrative of government and military affairs and turns to the affairs and life of the people."

In the execution of this plan the author has recourse, among other things, to the periodical literature of the day, and uses it freely—too freely, perhaps. He thus carries us back nearly a hundred years, and we live right in among the people of that period. We learn of their games, their gambling, their balls and dances, the character of their inns, election scenes, plantation life, their amusements in general, their methods of hospitality, as well as of their schools, the legislative debates and enactments, the national treaties, their estimate of public men, etc. On this last point, we fear Prof. McMaster has used the press too freely and given too much credit to its estimates and criticisms. We know how freely the papers use and abuse the names and reputations of our officials, and if we take them as our guide we will likely go wide of the mark. This may account for the author's statement that Washington, *as a man*, was not at all what we have had him pictured to us. We have only read of General Washington and President Washington, but

know very little of George Washington, he says, and more than hints of weaknesses and crooked ways that make him quite a different being from the model man we have so long heard about. In this field we should tread cautiously. Campaign literature and criticisms from the opposition press are very unreliable in forming our estimates of public men.

We welcome this work as giving a comparatively full history of the period covered, in an interesting and graphic style, and especially as giving us an inside view of the people—how they lived, what were their occupations and amusements, the rise and progress of mechanical inventions, the improvements that have increased the conveniences of life, and many, very many other things that histories ordinarily say little or nothing about. It is a history of the *people*, just as its name indicates.

LUTHERAN BOOK STORE, PHILADELPHIA.

*Lectures on the Epistles.* For Sundays and the Chief Festivals. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., LL. D., Author of "Lectures on the Gospels," "On Daniel," "On Leviticus," "On the Apocalypse," etc. Complete in two volumes. pp. 521, 534. 1885.

These two fine volumes are a credit to the Lutheran pulpit. The author of them has put much of his pulpit work into books, and they have been widely circulated and favorably received, giving his name an honorable prominence as both a preacher and a writer. But in this latest work he seems to have surpassed his previous efforts and has given what must be regarded as his chief work.

No attempt had been made before this to prepare and publish a full series of discourses on the Gospels and Epistles for the Church Year for our own English-speaking Lutherans. There was an open space to be entered. The completion of these two volumes—following the two on the Gospels—has therefore covered this unoccupied ground. Dr. Seiss did well to undertake the task, as the result of his efforts shows.

These lectures are marked by many excellences Their homiletical form is not indeed easily classified. The method of treating sections of scripture which constitute the lesson for the day, is, sometimes, to form its general topic into a theme and then discuss it under guidance of the chief statements of the passage, and, sometimes, to seize the leading distinct truths as topics and then unfold them. The discussion is characterized by directness, clearness and energy. We are greatly pleased with the prevailing earnest simplicity of the style—adapted to popular, easy apprehension. Their best quality of all is that they never turn aside from the steady aim to preach Christ as "the way, the truth and the life."

It is hardly necessary to say, however, that we dissent from some of Dr. Seiss' teaching on the order and relations of Christ's second coming. We would prefer to have these fine lectures thoroughly conformed

to the teaching of our Church on this subject. But the excellences of his work are so many and high that we forbear pressing any adverse criticism of this feature.

IVISON, BLAKEMAN, TAYLOR & CO., NEW YORK.

*Standard Classical Atlas.* For Schools and Colleges. With an Alphabetical Index giving the Latitudes and Longitudes of nearly 10,000 Places.

Beginning with a map of the world as known to the people of two thousand years ago, and closing with a map of the Roman empire in its widest extent, this atlas contains the maps of the several divisions of Europe, Asia and Africa—more than twenty-five in all—on fine, heavy paper and well bound. They are all of marked excellence, sharp in outline and printed in the best style. To the classical student, and indeed to any reader of ancient history, they will be a help and delight. The whole atlas is unsurpassed by anything of the kind we have seen.

PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION, PHILADELPHIA.

*Half Hours with the Lessons of 1886.* Chapters on the Bible Texts chosen for Sabbath-school study during 1886 in connection with the International Lesson Series, by Twenty-four Presbyterian Clergymen. pp. 464.

Among the clergymen that prepared these contributions to the Study of the International Lessons for the present year are Drs. Hall, Herrick Johnson, A. E. Kittredge, Howard Crosby, A. T. Pierson, T. L. Cuyler and others who with these rank among the most eminent and popular preachers of the country. It were hard to find anywhere more substantial help pressed in so small a compass.

*Scotland's Influence on Civilization.* By Rev. Leroy J. Halsey, D. D., LL. D., author of "Literary Attractions of the Bible," "The Beauty of Immanuel," "Living Christianity," etc. pp. 256.

Although Scotland does not now fill much space on the page of political history, it was once quite otherwise. Her past national history, and what she has been and is now in theology, in science, in philosophy, in art, in the pulpit, in higher education, in general literature, make a record which may well kindle the pride of any people. The influence of all this on civilization is told, and well told, in these pages. The interest is well sustained throughout, and the book will be laid down with the regret that there is not more of it.

*In His Steps:* A Book for Young Christians setting out to follow Christ. By J. R. Miller, author of "Week-Day Religion," "Home-Making," etc. pp. 120.

As the title page indicates, this little book is intended for young Christians, and an excellent one it is. The lesson taught is, to follow

in Christ's steps and strive to attain his likeness. In ten chapters this lesson is inculcated in the duty of beginning well; in taking the Christian life as the ideal; in living for God in holy consecration; in meeting temptation; in the helps found in prayer, the Bible, and the Church's services, etc. There are few books that can more profitably be put into the hands of young church members.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

*The Period of The Reformation*, 1517–1648. By Ludwig Häuser. Edited by Wilhelm Oncken, Professor of History at the University of Giessen. Translated by Mrs. C. Sturge. New Edition, complete in one volume. pp. 702. 1885.

In a former notice of this volume the QUARTERLY expressed its appreciation of it as a standard, impartial and evangelical work on the Reformation Period. The press generally has given a high estimate of the work and the demand for it must have been very considerable to justify a new American edition so soon. It covers a most important epoch, the interest in which is constantly increasing and it offers to students the attractive merit of compactness.

The present edition is on heavier paper with a wider margin than the previous one and has the impress of the University Press, Cambridge. "Geissen" on the title-page is evidently a misprint for "Giessen," where Oncken is Professor of History.

*Parables of the Lake*, or the Seven Stories of Jesus by the Sea of Galilee. A Sunday Book for Young Readers. By J. R. Macduff, D. D. pp. 202. 1885.

Dr. Macduff's wonderful powers of description and narration appear to very good effect in these explanations of the seven beautiful parables spoken by Jesus at the Lake of Gennesaret. He has evidently studied the great Master's method of illustrating divine truths by homely pictures and stories and has thus acquired the capacity of reproducing the Saviour's parables and setting them in the circumstances and forms of thought that mark the life of to-day. The bright little volume is designed for and well adapted to young readers and will be read with deep interest not only by them but by many of riper years.

*Metaphors in the Gospels*. A Series of Short Studies, by Donald Fraser, D. D., author of "Synoptical Lectures on the Books of Holy Scripture," etc. pp. 374. 1885.

This work is in its contents not unlike the above but it covers much more material and covers it in a different manner. Dr. Frazer takes up all the metaphors employed by the great Teacher, that is, all his sayings that possess the element of analogy and comparison, and gives on each one a brief expository discourse, the character of which is didactic rather than hortatory. These expositions are sober yet very suggest-

ive and often striking. Take for an example his interpretation of the "keys" being given to Peter. What a mass of error is swept away by the single statement that to Peter it was granted first to open the door of faith to the Jews at Jerusalem; next to the Samaritans, a kind of intermediate people; and finally to the Gentiles.

We know of nothing on this phase of the Gospel so complete and so helpful. Ministers and all who impart spiritual instruction will find it a most excellent vade mecum. To them it serves the two-fold purpose of opening the richness of divine truth contained in these similitudes and of furnishing them with the highest models of conveying and illuminating religious instruction. Were the Saviour's method of imparting saving doctrine studied more and the style of illustration he employed followed by all who preach in His name, we should witness not only larger audiences but also greater moral results.

*The Hebrew Feasts* in their relation to recent critical hypotheses concerning the Pentateuch. By William Henry Green, Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary. (The Newton Lectures for 1885). pp. 329.

When the bold and reckless theories of Reuss, Wellhausen and Kuenen on the "Higher Criticism" first shocked the American mind through the writings of Professor Robertson Smith, it was as creditable to our scholarship as it was gratifying to a believing Church to find that we had amongst us men fully competent to grapple with this daring and dangerous foe. None of these rendered abler and more effective services in exploding the hypotheses concerning the composite character of the Pentateuch than the Princeton Nestor, whose able articles in the *Presbyterian Review* and the *Princeton Review* (published in book form: "Moses and the Prophets," by Carters in 1883) were among the first published in America in defense of the antiquity and unity of the Pentateuch. The purpose of the present lectures is to test Wellhausen's hypothesis by an examination of the Hebrew Feasts. Their result shows that it finds no support from that quarter. While one of its main defences, it is really worth nothing.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

For Sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

*The Story of Greece.* By Prof. James A. Harrison, of Washington and Lee University. pp. 515.

Just the book for bright youths. Leaving the beaten path of simply recording battles and chief events in the history of the nation, Prof. Harrison has culled from these what is of real importance and interwoven with them much of the mythology of the Greeks, their fine stories, how they lived, interspersing it all with stirring and illustrative anecdotes. He has pursued this plan in accord with the sentiment of Froude, that "not all things are worth relating, or all historical figures

worth describing; but some things and some persons deserve to be commemorated eternally." On this principle of selection and following the chronology so far as it can be done with confidence, he has here given a story that is as fascinating as a romance. This volume belongs to the series entitled "The Story of the Nations." If the others in the series prove as good as this, it will make a most desirable historical set of books.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

*Angsburg Songs for Sunday Schools and other Services.* pp. 208.

This singing book has been prepared by a committee appointed by the General Synod and published by the Lutheran Publication Society, and for these reasons may very properly be urged upon our Sunday-schools. It is not expected, however, to be accepted on these grounds, but to commend itself on its own merits. This it will do. The topical index shows that due regard has been had for the church year, especially the leading festivals, and the Order of Service at the beginning, as also the Matin and the Vesper Service at the close, are in full accord with the genius and spirit of the Lutheran Church. The hymns and songs have been judiciously selected, nonsense being excluded, however fascinating the jingle may be, and sound religious sentiment being made the *sine qua non* of acceptance. We notice with gratification, that much of the music has been composed by some of our Lutheran clergymen. The times are ripe for the book, and we believe it will meet a long felt want in the Church.

WARREN F. DRAPER, ANDOVER, MASS.

*Discourses on some Theological Doctrines as related to the Religious Character.* By Edwards A. Park, D. D. pp. 390.

Dr. Park's wide reputation for profound learning naturally leads to great expectations as to anything coming from his pen. And he does not disappoint. These discourses are worthy of his name. "They were preached," he says in the preface, "during the years when the author was delivering his theological lectures. They were connected with his lectures, as they were designed to exhibit certain practical relations of certain theological doctrines, to show that the doctrines were to be revered for their use in religious experience as well as for their harmony with sound reason and divine inspiration." This purpose is apparent throughout and well sustained. There are fourteen sermons on the following subjects: The Indebtedness of the State to the Clergy; The Prominence of the Atonement; The Revelation of God in His Works; The Power of the Gospel; Union with Christ; Eternity of God; All the Moral Attributes of God Comprehended in His Love; The Design of God in His Work of Creation; The System of Moral Influences in which Men are Placed; The Gospel Preached to the Poor;

Conscience; Influences affecting the Character of Christ considered as a Man; The Sorrow of the Redeemer in Anticipation of His Death; The Righteous Man's Satisfaction with the Character of God. *These are themes*, and here are discourses suited to the themes. The outlines of the sermons in the table of contents are a good feature.

The line of thought and method of treatment are of such high character that these discourses will be appreciated only by men of more than average intelligence. They would likely seem very dull and intolerably long to more than half of an ordinary congregation. But to thinking men of fair grasp of mind they will be highly interesting and full of profit. In them will be found a large part of a treatise on didactic theology, though without the systematic treatment of formal lectures, Dr. Park's aim being to get away from the formal and technical and to show the practical bearings of the doctrines. He has succeeded.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, NEW YORK.

*The Lord's Day: Its Universal and Perpetual Obligation.* A Premium Essay. By A. E. Waffle, M. A.

This book is popular in tone, written for the public rather than for scholars, though it shows considerable research into and familiarity with English works upon the subject. Save through the medium of translations, the author appears ignorant of German thought and discussion. He is a thorough-going Sabbatarian and ably argues his view. He is clear in his reasoning and statements, full of apt illustration, but inclined to redundancy and repetition which detract from both the interest and effect of the book.

The first portion on the necessity of the Sabbath is inductive in its character. Out of the demands of the physical, intellectual, moral, religious and social nature of man the Sabbath-need comes. The second part seeks to demonstrate that the Sabbath was made for all men, since it was from the creation a primary moral fact, since it is a part of the moral law, which has never been repealed. The day has been changed from the seventh to the first, but not the purpose or command.

He then reviews the theories which seek to found the observance of the Lord's day on other grounds than the command itself and, after pointing out the distinctions between the Jewish Sabbath and the Lord's day, concludes with thoughtful and timely suggestions in regard to what may and what may not be done on Sunday.

With it all, the mere fact that it is necessary to write a book of four hundred pages to show the divine obligation of the Sabbath indicates that the observance of the Lord's day is on somewhat different grounds from the other commands of the moral law. The latter commend themselves decisively to the conscience and are received of all well-disposed men. The law of the Sabbath rests upon other reasons. The Jewish Sabbath is abolished. The Lord's day of apostolic institution remains,

in which the law of the Sabbath, so far as it is not special, determinative and typical but involves the essential principles of rest and service of God, continues and is binding on Christians.

This book is profitable and is a strong treatise, specially adapted to the general reader, upon a subject which should be enforced with special emphasis upon this self-seeking and worldly generation that scruples not to rob God of His day. C. S. A.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA.

*Our Young Folks' History of the Roman Empire.* By William Sheppard. Illustrated. pp. 478.

After a chapter on the causes which led to the formation of the Roman Empire, this history begins with the reign of Augustus, B. C. 27, and closes with the fall of the empire in A. D. 476, the line of emperors ending with Romulus Augustulus. It is written in a style that will be sure to enlist the interest of the young reader, and the publisher and book-binder have combined to make it attractive in every way. The sixteen illustrations and the map of the Roman empire in its widest extent are fine. We notice that, while the author gives credit to Gibbon, Keightley and four or five others, he says nothing about Tacitus; and yet whole pages, here and there, are little less than close translations from the annals and histories of that author. We were particularly struck with this in reading pp. 47–52, and in the reigns of Vitellius, Vespasian, and a few of their successors. This is a good source to draw from, but credit might as well be given. This is a good book to put into the hands of bright boys of fourteen years and over.

AM. S. S. UNION, 1122 CHESTNUT ST., PHILADELPHIA.

*Tent and Saddle Life in the Holy Land.* By Rev. David Van Horne, D. D., author of "The Mountain Boy of Wildhaus; a Life of Ulric Zwingli," etc. pp. 352.

Palestine will never cease to have an interest for the Bible reader, and books of travel through the Holy Land will always attract him. Of the smaller volumes that have appeared the one under review is excellent, and, as it seems specially adapted for young readers, it should find its way into the S. S. library. Valuable notes are added by editor Rice, of the Am. S. S. Union, and the illustrations are good—many of them quite superior. The book is written in an easy and vivid style, maintaining interest throughout.

PAMPHLETS.

Stall's Lutheran Year Book for 1886 has been increased in size and improved by a number of new features. The price, however, remains the same—25 cents per copy. It can be had from Rev. S. Stall (Lancaster, Pa.), himself, or from any Lutheran publication house in the United

States. Its full and carefully compiled statistics are of the highest value.

*Christ's Descent into Hell.* A sermon, by Rev. P. C. Henkel, D. D., President of Concordia College, Conover, N. C.

*A Brief History of the Beginning of the Mission Work* in Nicomedia by the American Board of Foreign Missions. By Rev. Garabed Nergararian.

*Synodal Bericht*, verhandlungen der deutschen evang-luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio, und anderen Staaten. Michigan Districts. A. D. 1885. Luth. Concordia Verlag.

*An Address on Parental Instruction and Government*, delivered before the West Branch Conference of the Susquehanna Synod. By Rev. W. H. Gotwald, A. M.

ALMANACS.

*The Lutheran Almanac and Year Book.* Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia.

*Der Lutherische Kirchen-Kalender.* German Publication House, Chicago, Ill.

*Evangelische Kalender.* Hrsg. von der Evangel. Synode von Nord-America. Past. R. Wobus, St. Charles, Mo. pp. 128.

SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN
ESTABLISHED 1846.

The most popular **Weekly** newspaper devoted to science, mechanics, engineering discoveries, inventions and patents ever published. Every number illustrated with splendid engravings. This publication furnishes a most valuable encyclopedia of information which no person should be without. The popularity of the SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN is such that its circulation nearly equals that of all other papers of its class combined. Price. $3.20 a year. Discount to Clubs. Sold by all newsdealers. MUNN & CO., Publishers. No. 361 Broadway, N. Y.

PATENTS. Munn & Co. have also had **Thirty-Eight years'** practice before the Patent Office and have prepared more than **One Hundred Thousand** applications for patents in the United States and foreign countries. Caveats, Trade-Marks, Copy-rights, Assignments, and all other papers for securing to inventors their rights in the United States, Canada, England, France, Germany and other foreign countries, prepared at short notice and on reasonable terms.

Information as to obtaining patents cheerfully given without charge. Hand-books of information sent free. Patents obtained through Munn & Co. are noticed in the Scientific American free. The advantage of such notice is well understood by all persons who wish to dispose of their patents.

Address MUNN & CO., Office SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, 361 Broadway, New York.

THE

# QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

# THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

APRIL, 1886.

## ARTICLE I.

### MIRACLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By PROF. L. A. FOX, D. D., Roanoke College, Salem, Va.

"If miracles were, in the estimation of a former age, among the chief supports of Christianity, they are at the present among the main difficulties and hindrances to its acceptance." This language of Prof. Baden Powel, some years ago, has been very often repeated, by some theists as well as others. It implies that the controversy so long waged in respect to miracles has been settled. Some so regard it, and take a supercilious air at the mention of miracles, as if they belonged to the class of ghosts and fairies and deserved no more respect than the vagaries of superstition, or they plainly term them popular fables. The silence of friends has been misconstrued into an acknowledgment of defeat.

But the controversy is not settled. If less has been written in defence during the last decade, it is, partly, because the old facts and proofs are as valid as ever, and, partly, because the conflict has changed and the immediate point of dispute is not the evidences of Christianity but the existence of God. The great body of the Church is not represented by men who endorse the sentiment of Prof. Powel, but it still regards miracles

among the chief supports of our religion. Nor do all scientific men adopt it. That language was a few days ago repeated in the presence of an eminent teacher in one of our colleges, who has devoted many years to Natural Science, and drew from him this emphatic remark, "That is not true," and he is one among hundreds of very able scientific men who believe in the miracles of the Bible as firmly as did any former age.

While this is true, it must be acknowledged that there are some, respectable both in number and character, who admit the supernatural in religion but are in doubt as to the miracles. It is a significant fact that, though the former edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica has a valuable articles on miracles, the late edition has not, while it has a long and able article on Christianity in which its supernatural character is cordially recognized. It represents the thinking of a portion of the educated community in religion.

The extent of skepticism in our age is greatly exaggerated. Just as every pain is pronounced the severest, so our age is pronounced the most skeptical. Infidelity is not so widespread, either in England or America, as it was in the beginning of the present century. We have only to read a letter like that of Dr. S. I. Prime, published a few years ago in the *New York Observer*, in which he recorded the observations made in his youth, or review a few pages of the religious history of that day to be fully assured of this fact. The form, however, has changed. Then it was Deistic, now it is rather Atheistic. Then it was dogmatic in its unbelief, now it is fashionable to doubt or avow agnosticism, to profess a desire to believe but claim an inability to be satisfied. Skepticism may be slightly increasing, especially in regard to miracles.

The doubt, or the positive unbelief, in respect to miracles has its proximate cause in the rapid development of the Natural Sciences. We have recently traced further back than ever before the presence of law. The discoveries of Dalton, Cavendish, Priestly and others gave a great impulse to the study and opened up new views of nature. We have become infatuated by success and have enthroned a new deity in law. We find the presence of law everywhere. We have books on the Reign

of Law, Unity of Law, and kindred subjects. We propose to explain everything by law, and any fact, no matter how authenticated, unless it can be arranged under some natural law is denied. The microscope and the retort have so blinded us that we have lost the power of appreciating anything that we cannot subject to their examination. Soul and God have been ruled out of the universe.

Within the last twenty-five years the hypothesis of evolution has found an acceptance that has hitherto been denied it. The zeal of its friends under the leadership of Darwin has quickened observation in certain fields and brought out some new facts and placed some old ones in such a different order that they seem new. It has been applied to all departments of science: language, history, government, morals, and religion. We are overpowered by the confident, dogmatic bearing of the men of the new science. We are persuaded not so much by proofs as by the authoritative manner. We profess to be converted—afraid of their scorn. We are carried into a sweeping induction, and from the mysteries supposed to be explained we confidently expect that very soon the last knot will be loosed and that we will be able to exclaim, not like Cousin who could say only "almost," but, Behold! the world is fully known. We forget that dogmatism is not proof, that many of the conclusions have already been rejected, that many more are awaiting re-examination and that some of those given forth as established truth will, very probably, go like some of their predecessors. We forget that there are other fields of knowledge just as certain as those of Natural Science, and that there are other truths, though sometimes modified by scientific discoveries, which have the right to modify the conclusions of the scientist. Though we do not know what new principles and powers may be developed, yet we do know that science will never prove that there is no God, that miracles are impossible, and that a dead man, in a state of decomposition, raised to life by a word, is not a miracle. Unlimited progress in one line is impossible, and boundaries will be reached that cannot be passed.

Very closely connected with this cause of skepticism is another, which prepared the way for it and in some degree under-

lies it. Our age is very much afraid of authority and has great confidence in the self-sufficiency of reason. This is seen in all departments of science, in reform movements in educational methods and political administrations, and in prominent tendencies in theology. So manifest is this influence that it has been put down as the prime cause of unbelief as to miracles.

The Reformation emancipated thought from bondage to the Roman Church. For many preceding centuries the student was forced to govern his investigations by the spirit of the papal court. The Pope was sovereign not only in theology but also in philosophy and science. Those who dared to think for themselves had to pay the penalty, of which fact Roscelinus and Galileo are well-known examples. Scholastic philosophy was forced to move in a narrow circle, and the rigorous minds of the schoolmen for a sufficient field for activity had to divide and subdivide until they descended to trivialities. They are often censured when they ought rather to be pitied. Luther brought liberty. Next after theology, philosophy availed itself of the freedom. Descartes became the leader of the new philosophy, inaugurating the new methods. He rejected all authority, and took his stand on the intuition of self-existence. Philosophy became morbidly afraid of all authority. Reid was a Protestant minister and Condillac a Roman Catholic priest, but in their philosophic writings there is not the slightest trace of their relations to the Church. Reason was regarded as absolute sovereign in her sphere and philosophy as absolutely independent. No assistance from the Scriptures was accepted. That spirit was transmitted and rules in a very large part of the thinking of to-day. It implies that reason is infallible.

This assumption is so manifestly false that in seems almost unnecessary to discuss it. Philosophy following its self-sufficient guide has fallen into reproach, and it is fashionable to speak derisively of metaphysics. Kant, we know, prepared the way for Hegel, and now we hear dissatisfaction confessed in the cry, "Back to Kant;" but Kant's Antinomies of reason are famous, and he frankly acknowledged the unreliability of Speculative Reason without telling us how we may save the Practical Reason. Hamilton professed nescience. It has been said that

no idea is so absurd that some philosopher has not avowed it. Reason has somewhere sadly erred. Science too has its slips to acknowledge. Practical men have pushed experiment to success in the face of demonstrations of the impossibility of succeeding. Despite Lardner's clear proof that steamships could never cross the Atlantic, they have; and against scientific conclusions the Atlantic cable was laid. Old theories, accepted as positively established, have been forced to yield to new ones. Reason even in those sciences boasting the name of exact, has not always been right. What guarantee have we that in the last year or two it has leaped up to infallibility?

Reason in its primary intuitions is infallible, but no primary intuition can be brought against miracles. In the process of reasoning, in our generalizations and in our analytic deductions, we often make mistakes. Our observations are often imperfect. We are often influenced by prejudices and passions. Any logician will tell us of the material and formal fallacies into which we are often betrayed.

We cannot rise above authority. We must rely on authority for the facts upon which a large majority of our premises are based. We do not hesitate to believe many things upon testimony. Absolute independence is impossible, and an effort to attain it is suicidal. With all the boasted independence of reason the great majority of those who doubt miracles do so upon authority. They can not admit authority in religion, but they can against it. Sincere convictions, even in doubt, are to be respected; and so also is consistency. Reason is asked to examine the evidence of miracles, to apply rigidly the laws admitted as sound in other cases, and to accept only when it would on any similar subject.

Whatever many may think, miracles are not rejected because of the want of evidence. It is not reason that rules. This has been frankly confessed by Lecky. "Belief in *miracles has not been reasoned down*, but simply faded away." He illustrates it by the opinion in regard to fairy tales. "The question of the credibility of fairy tales has not been resolved by an examination of evidence, but by an observation of the laws of historic development. Wherever we find an ignorant and rustic population,

the belief in fairies is found to exist, and circumstantial accounts of the apparitions are circulated. But invariably with increased education this belief passes away. It is not that the fairy tales are refuted, or explained away, or even narrowly scrutinized. It is that they cease to appear." (History of European Morals, p. 370). So men disbelieve against any amount of evidence whatever because by some process they cannot explain, they pronounce miracles no better than fairies. Reason overreaches itself and becomes unreason.

If Mr. Lecky is right, the prime cause is not intellectual but moral. Not every skeptic is a morally bad man. Often however the real reason is the same as in the case of Peter who, when he felt that he was in the presence of God because in the presence of a great miracle, cried out, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." Paul thought that the carnal mind is at enmity with God, and was therefore unwilling to receive the things of God. This moral cause is at least sufficiently common to put us on our guard in case of our own doubts, and to be remembered in dealing with the doubts of others. We may deceive ourselves in the belief that we are jealous for the truth when really we are governed by some other influences. We may sigh for a revelation from God and then reject it when it comes. Honest inquirers will seek carefully to know themselves.

If there is not much that is new to be said on the subject of miracles, still it will be profitable to go over the old truths in the light of the present.

### THE NATURE OF MIRACLES.

Some of the objections to miracles are valid only against the misconceptions of them, and it is of great importance, therefore, that we understand their true nature.

The New Testament, with which we are more particularly concerned in this article, does not give us anything approximating a formal definition. The apostolic doctrine must be gathered from the terms employed to express miracles and certain statements made in the accounts of them. They were called wonders (*τερας, θαυμασιος.*) Matt. 24 : 24, Mark 13 : 22, Acts 2 :

22, Rom. 15 : 19, etc. These terms express only the extraordinary. They record only the impression made upon the witnesses, the emotions awakened. From the words we could not tell whether they were to be ascribed to natural or supernatural agents, created or divine powers. Nature sometimes produces *τερατα*. So do men and demons. Miracles were also called powers (*δυναμις*) Mark 9 : 39, Acts 8 : 13, Gal. 3 : 5, Heb. 2 : 4, etc. This word points to the source of the wonder in some extraordinary power; but it may be natural or supernatural power. They were also called signs (*σημειον*) Matt. 24 : 24, John 2 : 11, 3 : 2, 6 : 26, Acts 4 : 16, Rev. 16 : 14, 19 : 20, etc. The purpose of miracles, as here indicated, was to be a sign of superior authority, the mark of a peculiar function. But this term, like that of wonders, is applied to false Christs (Matt. 22 : 24), to demons (Rev. 16 : 14), and to false prophets (Rev. 19 : 20). There are passages in which these were qualified and ascribed to God. "Approved of God among you by powers and wonders and signs" (*δυναμεις, τερασι, σημειοις*), Acts 2 : 22. "God wrought special miracles by the hand of Paul" (*δυναμεις ου τας τυχουσας*) Acts 19 : 11. They are made synonymous with gifts of the Holy Ghost, Heb. 2 : 4. Christ calls his own miracles the works of God. Miracles, then, in the general New Testament sense are wonders, performed by extraordinary power, as signs of some special gift or mission. But there is a broad distinction drawn between the miracles of Christ and the apostles, and those of devils and false prophets. There is no explanation of the latter, while the former are explicitly ascribed to God. There is manifest ground in that distinction for the opinion of Hollaz: Facit ea miracula Deus solus, yet in the use of the terms there is ground also for the opinion of Gerhard, who says that the Scriptures attribute real miracles to Satan and that the lying wonders are not such as to their form but their end. Perhaps a majority of theologians of the present day agree with Hollaz, but there are very able men who believe with Gerhard.

The doctrine of the New Testament in regard to Christian miracles is that they were wonderful works, largely in nature, performed by the power of God as signs of a divine commission.

Whether they were against law or above it, whether by law or immediate power, the Scriptures leave unsettled. The more hidden nature of miracles must be learned from the facts recorded.

Theologians have given formal definitions. These definitions may be divided into two classes according to the conception of the relation of miracle to law. That of certain philosophers may be regarded as constituting a third class.

Some theologians define miracles as violations of the laws of nature. So Quenstedt: Miracula vera et propria dicta sunt, quae contra vim rebus naturalibus a Deo inditam, cursumque naturalem, sive per extraordinariam Dei potentiam efficiuntur. (Quoted by Dr. Woods in Knapp). Buddaeus says, Per miracula ordo naturae tollitur, (Dogmaticae, L. s. c. p. §28). In another section he controverts the principle of Spinoza: Nihil contra naturam contigere, qualifying it by adding, sine volunte creatoris. Leges enim naturae, a Deo semel constitutae, tamdiu firmiter persistunt, quamdiu ipse Deus, ceu naturae auctor, ipsas non tollit, aut suspendit (§30). Martensen among the more recent theological writers says, "A miracle, properly speaking, is a violation of the laws of nature." (Dogmatics, p. 221). Dr. Hodge uses the words "suspension or violation of the laws of nature," but explains them by the fact that one law may suspend or violate another.

These definitions contain the idea of the immediate agency of God, but are regarded as unfortunate in attempting too much. The recorded facts do not warrant us in saying that they are violation of law. One of the serious difficulties in the mind of a scientific man in accepting miracles is this idea. He may object to a violation of laws which he observes as perfectly uniform, but his science does not authorize him to say that it is either impossible or improbable that an event may be produced in nature above its laws. Dr. Haven observes that the whole force of the argument of Spinoza is against the idea of a violation of natural law. That this is not an essential part of the conception of miracles is seen in the second class of definitions. The words of Augustine have been often quoted, "A portent happens not contrary to nature but contrary to what we know as

nature. For how is that contrary to nature which happens by the will of God, since the will of God, so mighty a Creator, is certainly the nature of each created thing." (City of God, Vol. 2, p. 409. Clark's edition). Hollaz says, Miracula sunt effectus infinitae potentiae divinae, rari et insoliti, *supra* ordinem totius creatae producti. (Prol. iii., Quest 29). Knapp says, "God does not alter or disturb the course of things which he himself directs or counteract the laws which he himself established, but he accomplishes by means of nature, which he has thus constituted and which he governs, something more than is common and in connexion with unusual circumstances." (Theology, p. 59). Dr. Wood in connection with the opinion of Knapp gives us that of Teiftrunk: "The efficient supersensible Being may not suspend the laws or disarrange the course of nature but must employ nature as the means of producing the results. What is miraculous is not therefore *contrary* to nature but extraordinary, preternatural. The wonder-working being produces in the sphere of sense, and by the laws which govern this sphere, such an effect as does not occur in the ordinary course of things and could not be produced by the mere powers of nature. A miraculous event seems to encroach upon the course of nature without disturbing or displacing it." Nitsch says, "If a miracle were simply an event opposed to natural laws, a something unnatural and incomprehensible, and if the human understanding, together with entire nature, experienced, through its agency, merely a subversive shock, then would the defence of Christianity, a religion established by means of a grand system of miracles, have to contend against insurmountable difficulties. But the miracles of revelation, with all the objective supernaturalness essentially belonging to them, are in truth somewhat accordant with natural laws." (System of Doctrine, p. 83). Dr. Dick says, "Some have called a miracle a transgression or violation of the law of nature, but I do not think that these terms are well chosen." (Theology, vol. 1, p. 69). Dr. Turnbull says, "Miracles, though transcending nature, are not contrary to nature but are something over and above nature." "If anything is contrary to nature it is sin." "For the removal of sin, a coun-

teracting force is needed, a force above nature, yet in accordance with nature, a force of renewal and regeneration." (Christ in History, p. 314). Dr. McCosh says, "Miracles are not considered against nature, except as one natural agent may be against another—as water may counteract fire." Mr. Mansel says, "What is superhuman is miraculous." (Both quoted by Duke of Argyle).

The influence of the discussion may be seen in definitions that do not include the relation to natural law. Dr. Hodge defines "a miracle to be an event in the external world, brought about by the immediate agency of God." So also Van Oosterzee: "A miracle is an entirely extraordinary phenomenon in the domain of natural or spiritual life, which cannot be explained from the course of nature as it is known to us, and must therefore have been brought about by a direct operation of God's almighty will in order to attain a definite object." (Dogmatics, vol. 1, p. 127).

These opinions, selected from different periods, countries and schools, assure us that we need claim nothing more for miracles than that they are wrought in nature by the immediate agency of God without violating any of his laws. If we examine the miracles we find nothing more than a fact which nature in its ordinary operations could not do. We believe that there is no power in nature to accomplish them, but if there is, God alone knows how to command it, and whenever they exist he is immediately engaged. The blind received sight by a word or a touch. It was something far above nature, but the law was no more violated or suspended than if they had been relieved by a surgical operation. The blind who were not brought under the divine influence of Jesus remained in darkness. There is no power in nature to raise the dead, but the law was no more violated when Lazarus was raised than when the drowned, breathless and pulseless, is revived. Both alike would remain in the same condition but for the new power brought to bear upon them, in the one case above nature, in the other from nature. When Lazarus walked out of the grave no law was suspended, for the neighboring graves were wholly undisturbed. No miracle weakened any law of the world. God did by an immediate

effort what the ordinary laws were not intended to do. They are perfect for their purpose, and miracles were not intended to patch up the imperfection of the original creation. The material is subservient to the spiritual. When disorder is produced in the spiritual by the abuse of the power of self-determination, God avails himself of a receptivity in nature, implanted in the beginning, as a means of correcting the evil. That a miracle implies imperfection in the natural order is manifest sophistry.

The manner also in which God works miracles has been discussed. They have been ascribed to higher laws by two theories. One is that God provided for miracles in the establishment of nature, and now, while he leaves nature to its own laws, miracles appear at the appointed times. The other emphasizes the fact that God works through means, and claims that his means in miracles are the natural laws. The Duke of Argyle, the great advocate of the last, thus expresses it: "There is nothing incompatible with the belief that all exercises of God's power, whether ordinary or extraordinary, are effected through the instrumentality of means—that is to say, through the instrumentality of natural laws, brought out and used for a divine purpose." (Reign of Law, ch. 1). These theories are designed chiefly to get rid of the idea of interference with natural law. The first reminds us of Leibnitz's doctrine of Pre-established Harmony, originated to overcome a difficulty existing only in the minds of philosophers, the creation of their own speculation. Both theories imply a subordination of God to the laws of nature—a subordination for which no good reason can be assigned. Both are pure hypotheses, which fail to meet the conditions of a hypothesis: necessary, and explaining all the facts. Both of them overlook the fact that a miracle is not merely a physical effect but an effect in connection with a command. Both of them admit the assumption of the opposers of miracles that physical effects must have a physical cause—an assumption contradicted by common facts. A blush, a quickened pulse, trembling, are physical effects produced by thoughts. If either of the two hypotheses be true there is no evidence of its truth.

THE POSSIBILITY OF MIRACLES.

That men in all ages and countries and in all stages of culture have believed in miracles is evidence that there is no proof against their possibility to be drawn from the nature of the mind. The direct proof rests upon the fact of the existence of a personal God. Atheists and Pantheists, whether materialistic or idealistic, must of necessity deny the possibility of any power above nature. A deity identified with the world can have no power above nature. On this ground Hegelians in Europe and America deny miracles. While Hegel, despite his philosophy, is said by Canon Farrar to have been, like Kant and Schelling, practically a devout Christian, Emerson and his school hold Christ to have been a divine man but only as Mr. Emerson and all other good men are. The Agnostic can neither affirm nor deny anything in regard to miracles. He does not know whether there is a God, nor if there is whether he is a theistic or panthetic deity. He pronounces all such questions unscientific. In this way Prof. Huxley must be understood. "The denying the possibility of miracles seems to me quite as unjustifiable as speculative Atheism." "It has always been a favorite tenet of mine that atheism is as absurd, logically speaking, as polytheism." The discussion of the theistic question cannot enter into this article. Among the excellent recent works on this subject may be mentioned Diman's Theistic Argument and Valentine's Natural Theology.

The existence of a personal God admitted, there is no longer a question as to the possibility of miracles. This is very generally recognized. John Stuart Mill concedes this. "A miracle is no contradiction to the law of cause and effect; it is a new effect, supposed to be produced by the introduction of a new cause. Of the adequacy of that cause, if it exists, there can be no doubt, and the only antecedent improbability, which can be ascribed to the miracle, is the improbability that any such cause had existence in the case. All that Hume has made out, and this he must be confessed to have made out, is that no evidence can prove a miracle to any one who did not previously believe in the existence of a being or beings with supernatural powers." (Logic, p. 267). The two questions are: Is there a personal

God? What is the evidence of the miracle? With these concessions from so eminent an unbeliever as Mr. Mill it seems, as Rev. C. A. Row remarks in one of his books, a useless waste of time to discuss the possibility. An omnipotent God, who is a free sovereign in his kingdom, is a sufficient cause for any miracle which his goodness and wisdom may direct, and the only thing left for us to ask is, has he performed it?

In this connection we may look at the probability of miracles as seen from science. If science can show that God has repeatedly given existence to new species of beings on down through the geologic ages by immediate intervention, the great objections to miracles are removed. Many eminent men still believe in successive creations. Dana, who has no equal as a geologist in America, gives the weight of his great authority to this doctrine. Agassiz died in this faith. Buckland, Murchison, Mantel, Miller, Hitchcock taught it. Dr. Turnbull thought thirty years ago that "Geology has forever put the matter to rest." But evolution teaches a different opinion. A great many think that the evolution hypothesis is an established theory. Some naturalists, as Prof. Asa Gray, adopt it as only a good working hypothesis. Darwin tried to account for evolution by the law of Natural Selection and finding that insufficient added the supplementary law of Sexual Selection. Mr. Mivart and Mr. Nicholson have brought insuperable objection against Darwin's law, and Dr. Rudolph Schmid in his work on Darwinian Theories speaks of the Darwinian law as practically abandoned by all the great scientists. We are left with the hypothesis of evolution without a sufficient law. So far as evolution falls under observation there is a superintending mind, without which there is no advance but the contrary. No doctrine of evolution, so far as science has yet shown, can be maintained that does not need a constant Providence; and if God is superintending and directing the operations of his laws so as to bring in new orders of beings, we have his immediate agency, and what great objection to miracles?

But evolution is not an established fact. It may be the best explanation science can give for the existence of the world, but it is not satisfactory. There are many things essential to the

theory which are nothing but assumptions. Geologists are compelled to acknowledge that there are great gaps in the line, but they try to account for the missing links by the missing pages of the records. The records at many places are complete. The Duke of Argyle says, "Sir Robert Murchison has long ago proved that there are parts of the records singularly complete, and in those pages we have the proofs of creation without any indication of development. The Silurian rocks as regards oceanic life are perfect and abundant in the forms they have preserved, yet there are no fish. The Devonian Age followed tranquilly and without a break, and in the Devonian Sea suddenly fish appear—appear in shoals and in forms of the highest and most perfect type. There is no trace of links or transitional forms between the great Mollusca and the great class of fishes. There is no reason to suppose that such forms, if they had existed, can have been destroyed in deposits which have preserved in wonderful perfection the minutest organisms." (Primæval Man, part 2). Mr. Nicholson, the greatest scientist in Canada, has said in a book quite recently republished, "We have the clear right to expect that Palæontology should reveal to us such intermediate forms among the vast fossil remains with which we are acquainted. We cannot, however, in any case point to such forms." "No case is yet known to us, even taking the Tertiary period alone, in which we can point to a graduated series of intermediate forms by which one well-marked species can be shown to pass into another equally well-marked species." (Study of Biology, p. 141). Quatrefages says, "The impossibility of natural forces, when left to themselves, producing series of intermediary between two given specific types is one of the general facts which we call law." "Now order has existed in both kingdoms since the epochs when organic beings first peopled the solitudes of our globe, and it could only have been established and preserved by virtue of the impossiblity of a fusion of species with each other through indifferently and indefinitely fertile crossings." "But what science may affirm is that from all appearance such has had as point of departure a single primitive pair." (Human Species, pp. 80, 81, 84). What he says of man is equally applicable to all species. "When asked about

our origin, in the name of science I answer, I DON'T KNOW." (Ib., p. 128). Nicholson professes the same scientific ignorance in his definition of species. "Species is an assemblage of individuals which resemble each other in their essential characters, are able, directly or indirectly to produce fertile individuals and which do not (*as far as human observation goes*) give rise to individuals which vary from the general type through more than certain definite limits." (Study of Biology, p. 61). Evolution assumes that on the missing pages the intermediate species could be found. It ignores the absence of them where the record is complete. It assumes, against all observation, that species give rise to other species. The advocates of the historic miracles make no such assumptions as these.

Science cannot say, therefore, that God did not introduce miraculously the new species as they appear in the geologic ages. Its testimony, so far as it is capable of testifying at all, is to this fact. No scientific principle denies us the right to the belief in the miraculous as the most probable explanation of scientific facts. If God at any previous period, after the original creation, exerted his immediate power upon nature, bringing in effects above natural law, it is antecedently probable that there were miracles at the time of the organization of the Church. This much is certain, that science has not shown that they were either impossible or improbable.

### THE EVIDENCE OF MIRACLES.

There are three possible proofs of miracles. *First*, Permanent impressions made upon the natural world. Miracles leaving such impressions might have a scientific proof. But they are necessarily limited to permanent subjects. The evidence would consist in the existence of effects, which were manifestly produced by a power beyond any existing in nature. It would be a demonstrated proof if it were shown that the power was not only not known in nature but could not exist in nature. The miracles of the New Testament were not of a nature to admit of scientific proof.

*Second*, The evidence of the senses. The senses give us external facts while the other mental faculties give the character of

the facts. The senses may give us the fact of a strange animal, the reflective faculty gives us its classification. The senses in respect to miracles perform the same function as in other phenomena. No one will claim that they give us the *miraculous*. From the facts which the senses present we infer the character. Men of different degrees of culture, observing the same fact, may differ widely as to the explanation. Different ages have differed widely as to the cause of eclipses. Scientific men have differed as to the cause of water rising in a tube—formerly ascribing it to nature's abhorrence of a vacuum, now to the weight of the atmosphere. The explanation of a fact does not change the fact itself. The eclipse and the water in the tube presented the same phenomena when they were attributed to false causes that they do now when their true causes are known. When the phenomena are simple the philosopher can see no more than the peasant. When a blind man is restored suddenly to sight by a simple word learned and unlearned must see the same things, and as to the fact itself each would be a competent witness. Of this character were the large majority of the miracles of Christ. We have often been mistaken as to the explanation of facts brought under our senses and probably are mistaken still in regard to some, but if we saw a man whom we knew to be dead raised to life by a word we would know we witnessed a miracle. Our observation and explanation might not convince others but it would satisfy us. No speculative difficulty would shake our conviction in the least. The explanation of the manner in which the mind knows an external world does not change the fact that there is an objective world, and the speculative difficulties of philosophers have never weakened the confidence of men in their knowing the fact of its existence. Philosophers themselves outside of their study had no more doubt about their knowing it than the common people. So philosopher and plain man would know certainly that they saw a miracle in a case like that of the son of the widow of Nain. Assured that there was nothing concealed, no imposition upon the senses, the judgment of both upon any fact like those recorded in the New Testament would be spontaneous and decided.

*Third*, Testimony. Historical miracles such as were per-

formed by Christ and the apostles can be known in subsequent times only through testimony. Hume's argument was not against the possibility of miracles as facts but the possibility of proof by human testimony. It has been said that the argument has never been successfully refuted. That is not true, but some of the answers are better than others. Bablage in his Bridgewater Treatise and Dr. Ruffner in his lecture at the University of Virginia discussed it from the law of probabilities. Some have pronounced our belief in human testimony a primary principle and not a fact of experience. Some have tried to show in the argument a petitio principii. More labor has been given to the refutation than it deserves. Hume himself was not convinced by it, for he afterwards said that testimony could not prove a miracle in support of a new religion because of numerous impostures.

Hume was a philosophic skeptic and very fond of paradox. He placed authority against authority to create doubt, or to prove that certainty is impossible. In philosophy he sought a contradiction between reason and consciousness as both ultimate in authority. Consciousness, he said, affirms an immediate knowledge of the external world but reason affirms the impossibility of any such immediate knowledge. Skepticism is the necessary result. His argument against the proof of miracles was somewhat analogous. We are taught by experience the uniformity of nature. Experience teaches us the worth of human testimony. The laws of nature, so far as our experience goes, are perfectly uniform, but according to our experience human testimony often deceives. There may have been miracles in the past, but we cannot have our belief in the perfect uniformity shaken by that which is often untrustworthy. In reply, it is enough to say that the belief in the uniformity of nature is neither a matter of experience, as Hume said, nor a primary intuition, as Dr. Reid and many others have said, but is founded upon the primary principle that the same causes will have the same effects under the same conditions. It is also a primary principle that for every effect there must be a sufficient cause. For a miracle there is a sufficient cause in the almighty power of God. But for the agreement of a number of witnesses in every substantial point, known to have testified without precon-

cert, there is no cause except truth. In rejecting all possible proof by testimony Hume would leave us an event without any cause.

A more recent objection lies against proof by the testimony of a credulous age. As only the man who believes in ghosts will see them, or only to the age believing in fairies will they manifest themselves, so only in an age believing in miracles have they been performed, and no testimony from such ages can produce conviction. Lecky says, "It is a fundamental error in most writers on miracles that they confine their attention to two points—the possibility of the fact and the nature of the evidence. There is a third element which in these questions is of capital importance: the predisposition of men in certain stages of society towards the miraculous, which is so strong that miraculous stories are then invariably circulated and credited, and which makes an amount of evidence that would be quite sufficient to establish a natural fact altogether inadequate to establish a supernatural one." (European Morals, p. 384). "The Jews in the eyes of the Pagan had long been proverbial for their credulity, and the Christians inherited a double measure of their reputation. Nor is it possible to deny that in the matter of the miraculous this reputation was deserved." (p. 397). Christians of the apostolic age believed in miracles, that proves their credulity, therefore they are not to be believed! No miracle can ever be proved by a man who believes he has seen a miracle, and therefore a miracle cannot be proven by testimony at all. Is not this the real ground taken?

Lecky pays, in his preface, a beautiful tribute to Dean Milman as a personal friend possessing "an amazing extent and variety of knowledge, with a fervent love of the truth, wide tolerance, large, generous and masculine judgment of men and things, disdain of noisy triumphs and fleeting popularity of mere sectional strife." But Dean Milman records as historical facts the miracles of Christ, doubtless believed in them, was, therefore, credulous, and would not have been a competent witness if he had actually seen a miracle.

The fact that an age believes in miracles does not of itself convict it of credulity. The fact that there were some persons

in Rome imposed upon by false miracles does not prove that the apostles were.

If the Jews were credulus their credulity did not create miracles in the age preceding that of Christ, nor ascribe any to John the Baptist though recognized as a great prophet. If the miracles of Christ were the creations of credulity their absence in connection with John and in the preceding age is a fact to be accounted for.

Credulity finds only such miracles as are expected. Some of Christ's miracles were directly opposed to their preconceptions. No one believed in his self-resurrection.

Credulity does not create miracles that contradict deeply rooted prejudices and passionate convictions. The miracles of Christ were opposed to the prejudices of the Jews, and when they were unable to deny their supernatural character they ascribed them to Beelzebub. He healed on the Sabbath—an act which they supposed an exceeding great sin. When they charged him with blasphemy he performed miracles to convict them of their own guilt. Enemies as well as friends confessed that they were miracles.

Credulity never institutes examinations into the character of the facts. This was done by the people as well as by the Pharisees, and the trivial objections raised show that there were no grounds for suspecting any fraud. If the Jews were credulous in regard to other miracles they were not in regard to those of Christ and the apostles.

If we may not believe a credulous age as to its judgment of the facts we may believe it in its statements of them. Credulity does not necessarily make a people false and lying. A credulous man, if honest and truthful, would not solemnly testify that he saw a man whom he knew to have been blind many years suddenly restored to sight by a simple touch, if he had not seen it. A fact so simple, so easily examined, under open circumstances must be believed if asserted by a number of independent witnesses, even though they may be chargeable with credulity in some other respects. There are about forty miracles distinctly mentioned in the New Testament. The circumstances are fully given in a number of them. There was a pub-

licity and variety such as can be found nowhere else. We take the facts as recorded and examine them for ourselves. We examine the circumstances. We find no opportunity for imposture. Upon the evidence we pronounce them miracles. Credulity in witnesses does permit belief in some reported miracles because the circumstances were not open, but it has no bearing upon the testimony in regard to Christ's miracles.

In the objection we have been considering, and in much of the reasoning against miracles by others, the difference between those of the New Testament and the contemporary ones among the Romans is entirely ignored. It is said that no educated man believes in the miracles of modern times, nor in those of the Middle Ages, nor in those of the Church in the third century. It may be that educated men are mistaken in this wholesale condemnation of the miraculous especially among the earlier Christians. But granting that they are right in regard to all miracles after the apostolic period, we have a right to protest, both on the ground of the character of the facts and the evidence of them, against reasoning from subsequent miracles to those of the Scriptures. There is a great difference in their evidence and that of any reputed cotemporary miracle. True, both Suetonius and Tacitus report that Vespasian relieved a cripple by a miracle. But neither of them were witnesses, and they differ materially as to the part relieved, one saying it was a hand and the other a leg. Porphyry records the miracles of Apollonius of Tyana, but he writes a hundred years after his hero was dead. It is not true that men disbelieve in them against evidence but for the want of evidence. They are not reported by eye-witnesses. They were not carefully examined. They were wanting in important elements necessary to command our faith. But a great many disbelieve not from any examination but because it is fashionable, and then they rush on to reject those of Christ. In their ignorance they group things wholly unlike and condemn all together, and then demand our admiration for their superior minds or claim our sympathy because they cannot be satisfied.

In the evidence for the miracles of the New Testament the testimony of Christ is a very important factor. The day has

passed when his life and character can be remanded to the region of myths. They are now everywhere acknowledged facts. No one dares to deny that he was a great and good man. He claimed to work miracles. He appeals to them as credentials. He referred to them as answer to the question if he was the Messiah. He does this repeatedly. Now he either believed that he wrought miracles when he did not, and then was not a great man, or he appealed to them when he knew he had not performed them, and then he was not a good man. Shall we believe him to be the great and good man he is represented to have been even by his enemies, and accept his miracles, or shall we reject the miracles and believe him a weak or a bad man? If weak, whence that wonderful wisdom? If bad, whence that purity?

The testimony of Paul is also of great importance. In the four epistles acknowledged even by Tubingen to be genuine, he not only avows his perfect belief in the miracles of Christ, but claims to have performed miracles himself. He speaks of his miracles as well known facts. In regard to some of them he could not be mistaken. His character is above suspicion. He certainly knew whether they were miracles or not, and he was, just as certainly, no intentional impostor.

Paley has given the prominent features in regard to the testimony of the other apostles and evangelists so clearly and so forcibly that they need not be repeated here.

Laplace's objection based upon the lapse of time has been often shown not to be applicable to the testimony of the writers of the New Testament. Time does not affect written records as it does tradition. We have the testimony of eye-witnesses as immediately and directly as we can have that of an event transpiring now in Europe. The generations through which these letters have been transmitted have had little more to do with the matter contained than the mail agents who transmit letters from friend to friend. We know we have the very substance of what was originally penned.

The question of the relation of the truth to the evidence of the miracle has been discussed. John Stuart Mill has given the weight of his authority to the opinion that the doctrine con-

firms the miracle and not the miracle the doctrine. This is too generally accepted as true. We cannot prove the miracle by the doctrine, and then prove the doctrine by the miracle. If the doctrine is so clear as to commend itself as an immediate revelation without a miracle no credentials are necessary, and the miracle is superfluous. But no doctrine has the self-evidence of an immediate revelation from God, unless immediately inspired, and either no such immediate revelations can be given, except directly to each individual, or they must be confirmed by miracles. Without miracles no teacher can have an authority above that of reason. We could never without them make doctrines above reason a matter of faith.

But is there no truth in the opinion that doctrines confirm miracles? It is the antecedent certainty that God will perform no miracle unworthy of himself. A God of truth will not endorse a falsehood; and if a thing known to be false appears to be confirmed by a miracle, we know prior to examination that the miracle will not stand the test. God is wise; and if a miracle is in itself trivial, or accompanies a trivial matter, we know that upon a careful examination it will prove false. It is not that the doctrine confirms the miracle, but when the character of the doctrine or of the miracle is unworthy of God it is unnecessary to consider the evidence. If a doctrine that seemed to be false was confirmed by a miracle that sustained all the tests, we would believe the doctrine and wait for explanation. No miracles unworthy of God are found in the New Testament.

Miracles are not the only evidence of our religion. The character of the doctrines, the fruits, the conditions and circumstances of its spread, the language and many other facts make us certain that it was not given by man, but that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. But miracles do form one important element of the evidence. Without them but with all the others we would be wanting in the strength of certainty we now enjoy.

## ARTICLE II.

### WHY WE STUDY SKAKESPEARE.*

By Prof. J. A. Himes, A. M., Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.

There are still some good people of high intelligence who banish Shakespeare from their libraries and esteem it a wonder and almost a crime that a book so full of evil and earthly passion should be forced upon the attention of the young in a Christian college. They leaf over its pages and find passages whose profanity and vulgarity would condemn any other book, and they are not disposed to seek for gold among the dirt. These scruples are not to be treated lightly; on the surface, at least, they are reasonable; and it is binding upon us to show that both culture and Christianity may be promoted by the study of this marvellous poet and dramatist.

Shakespeare has probably had more to do with forming modern taste than any other writer; fiction and the drama, both diligently employed in character-painting, where he excelled, are the two popular kinds of literature. His influence is also felt in other departments. If the waning fires of our poetry are to be re-kindled at some blazing torch as those of the 16th century were by the rediscovered splendors of the Greek creative imagination, it is from present indications more likely to be that of Shakespeare than of any one else. We ask not so much what in such a case are to be the effects upon literature, but more broadly what are the benefits to be derived from a study of Shakespeare. As the moral influence is of course uppermost in the minds of those who condemn it altogether, we shall turn our inquiries chiefly in that direction.

It must be admitted, in the first place, that we do not go to him for sustained poetic beauty or sublimity. While it is not to be denied that we find in him some of the finest gems of poetry to be discovered anywhere, they are diamonds in the

*Given as a public lecture in Gettysburg, Jan. 25, 1886.

rough, generally met with accidentally, not set in elegant foil to add to their beauty, but so surrounded that we must remove them from their associations before we can really enjoy them. King and clown, philosopher and jester, lover and mischievous fairy, pure fancy and gross matter-of-fact, lofty reflection and vulgar necessity, so intermingle and jostle each other that we are annoyed, not to say shocked, at the sudden transitions from one to the other. So closely does jest follow sublimity that we are momentarily tempted to suspect the poet of trifling with his readers and their sensibilities.

Many illustrations of this will readily occur to you. Very often the sublimity of the situation contrasts strangely with the imbecility of the actors and their dialogue. What a grand figure is the aged Lear exposed to the fury of the storm, but what a sense of the grotesque comes over us as he utters the words, "Blow, winds, and crack your cheeks!" Portia hardly gets through the admirable part she plays in the trial of Shylock, before she devises a discreditable and wholly unnecessary trick upon her magnanimous husband. Hamlet in the very presence of his father's unquiet ghost and with its horrible tale of human guilt and purgatorial fires still ringing in his ears, is found jesting with his companions. He can soar into reflection, "What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals!" and then he can fall into a cynicism that shocks us by its suddenness and unexpectedness and leaves a most painful impression of insincerity. "And yet to me what is this quintessence of dust? man delights not me; no, nor woman neither, though by your smiling you seem to say so." What a descent from high speculation! All will remember the loftly images in Prospero's celebrated speech,

> "And like the baseless fabric of this vision,
> The cloud-clapped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
> The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
> Yea all which it inherit, shall dissolve
> And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
> Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff

As dreams are made on; and our little life
Is rounded with sleep."

A few words of transition hurry us from such sentiments into an account, that cannot be quoted here, of tricks played by Ariel upon a couple of besotted drunkards. Perdita may talk to Florizel about the "daffodils"

"That come before the swallow dares, and take
The winds of March with beauty; violets dim
But sweeter than the lids of Juno's eyes
Or Cytherea's breath; pale primroses
That die unmarried, ere they can behold
Bright Phoebus in his strength."

But the pretty strain is soon interrupted by the chatter of clownish shepherds, who furnish a contrast to the flower talk of the lovers by a suggestion of "garlic to mend kissing with."

No matter what explanations and excuses are offered for such association of incongruities, the effect is never elevating. We demand of the dullest wit some sense of the situation, so that if he cannot rise to it, he may at least have the grace to be silent. If his babblings break the spell of higher thoughts, we may be amused, if we are used to it; but we are more likely to be offended, if our intercourse has been marked with refinement and we are not in a particularly amiable mood. It is not surprising that many refined people have on this account condemned the dramatist to exclusion from their book-shelves.

It would, perhaps, follow from what has been said that we are not to look to Shakespeare for lofty ideals in morals. It is, indeed, possible that the poet might introduce into his plays the greatest variety of characters and yet keep his best men and women consistently dignified and virtuous throughout. To some extent he has done this, and yet it would be hard to find one ideally perfect character among all that he has given us. Who is there among his men that is without serious defects and could be taken as a model for imitation? Is it the melancholy Hamlet who insults an aged man and is cruel to a delicate woman and who destroys the innocent lives of both? Is it Prospero, the scholarly Duke, who neglects and forgets the affairs of his

dukedom, until bad men hold resistless sway; and who knows no more effective means of punishing a would-be assassin than hard words? Is it the gentlemanly Bassanio who makes it an object in his marriage to get means for the payment of debts with which his thriftless habits had burdened him? Is it the wealthy and generous Antonio, who can descend to abuse a Jew after the manner of street loafers? Is it the patriotic Brutus, whose philosophy and honors lead him to despise the practical wisdom of the less illustrious Cassius? Is it the impetuous Kent, who has been commended as the nearest of all to perfect goodness; or the impassive Horatio, each unable by his fidelity to prevent the tragedy to which he stood so near?

Nor among Shakespeare's women, delicately as he has drawn female character, is there any whom we can unreservedly commend. Miranda has no social experience, while Imogen is surfeited with the same. Juliet lacks womanly reserve; Ophelia, a decent self-assertion; Cordelia, tact; Portia, a proper delicacy; Desdemona, that feminine insight which appreciates difficult situations and can adapt its possessor to them. We do not, therefore, find in Shakespeare that power to exalt our thoughts, quicken our aspirations, think better of our capabilities, or move our wills to nobler action. Many writers far inferior to him are much more efficient in attuning the soul to divine harmony, or in awaking it to moral life and aiding its progress upward. Shakespeare may have been prevented both by his own limitations and by those of his art from presenting the highest type of man. The special motives introduced into human life by Christianity are conspicuous by their absence from his pages; partly, no doubt, because they were strange to the experience of the dramatist himself, and partly because they would have seemed out of place on a stage to which they were hostile. But it looks as though this were the result of intention fully as much as of impotence. When we take a wider view, it is evident that not only the principles of Christianity but the conventional rules of society are strangely wanting—all outside pressure upon the passions and motives of our being is removed. Here we find human nature not reduced to order and harmony by culture and self-discipline, but exultant and free "as in her prime." The

checks upon passion, if it would run riot, come from within,—from the powers and susceptibilities of humanity itself; pity draws the rein upon cruelty and avarice, fear upon ambition, love upon pride, natural affection upon the sense of wrong, reverence for an unseen Power upon falsehood. These restraints are often insufficient, our sense of fitness is shocked, our sense of order and progress is left unsatisfied, but there is a charm of their own about these "native wood-notes wild" to which few are insensible.

What, then, is the advantage of Shakespeare to us? It consists very largely in the fact that he has given us not an idealized but a real view of human life. The absence of moral purpose in his work enables him to be just and accurate in his portraiture. If he does not give us any example of man at his best, he does bring before us beings of widely different temperaments, different grades of intelligence, different stages of refinement and brutality, so that without leaving our sheltered homes we may have almost the whole world to move and feel and act before us. We may smile at the foibles and inexperience of youth, criticise the vanities and mistakes of maturer years, and pity the eccentricities of age, as we pass the actors in review. We behold social life in all its phases—humanity clothed in purple, or cowering in rags—while we are sitting at our own fireside. The pictures are true to life and do not mislead us; the atmosphere is clear and healthful, and if it is not invigorating or stimulating, neither is it foul with skepticism and misanthropy. All truth is precious and by no means least that which sheds light upon man in his social relations.

To Shakespeare we come as to a mirror, and find our own defects set forth and criticised and treated, sometimes with gentleness and sometimes with severity; sometimes so lovingly that we would hardly wish to part with them, and again so sternly that they seem little less offensive than downright crimes. The Merchant of Venice is particularly full in its delineations of the surface-features of character. There is an estimate of those that "evermore peep through their eyes" in laughter, as contrasted with those of such vinegar aspect that "they'll not show their teeth in way of smile." There is also a contrast be-

tween the garrulous fellow and the equally shallow grave and silent person. The characteristics of different nationalities are portrayed with much humor. Nothing is too small for notice, provided it is a true index of something really human. Some of our modern novelists have rivalled even Shakespeare in the careful patience with which they have described the most trifling acts. One of them takes up about four columns of a magazine with the fate of a shaving which a young woman is poking with her parasol, and which with the help of a young man she finally succeeds in putting a hole through! One of the chief advantages from this painful prolixity is doubtless to give us experience of the slowness of time, which we in this fast age are in some danger of forgetting. It takes us back to the days of childhood and to the solemn parlor where we were obliged to sit still for an hour and listen to melancholy talk, while grandfather's clock was ticking its deliberatest. We should make but slow progress in our study of human nature, if we were confined to the pages of Howells or James. What profound thing in character does poking a hole through a shaving suggest? Almost any nervous young woman in the presence of a young man to whom she is partial might do the same under similar circumstance, and like serious results might even follow if the other sex carried parasols. When Shakespeare deals with trifles he treats them as trifles, and does not allow them to get in the way of the great passions and motive powers of life.

But what is the advantage of having men's foibles and eccentricities set down in books? Couldn't we go directly to life and get our knowledge of human nature at first hand? Possibly, if we were all observers as shrewd as Shakespeare and all had the breadth of his experience with men, we might. But it will be acknowledged that he was an exceptional observer and had unusual opportunities for intercourse with men. Then as we take the testimony of an expert instead of entering into a long and tedious examination for ourselves in other branches of knowledge, so we take Shakespeare as an expert in the science of humanity. Though he does not himself apply his discoveries directly to the improvement of our social life, he makes it easy to do this for ourselves, to avoid the peculiarities and eccentric-

ities which produce friction in our social machinery and to attain the cosmopolitism which adapts itself easily to all situations.

It is not, however, chiefly as a social being that Shakespeare treats man. His plots usually turn upon something far more important; they go deep into the moral nature. Ambition, avarice, jealously, filial ingratitude, falsehood and revenge on the one hand, and love, generosity, patriotism, fidelity and piety on the other, are recognized as the essential marks of character. Here the dramatist divides his men and women into two classes by a broad line of demarcation running as deep as life. Even clowns and fools are glorified by being associated with the cause of kindliness and justice. But though the good and the bad become distinct enough before they disappear from the scene, yet the transition from innocence to guilt is gradual and by almost insensible steps. We can see that in many, perhaps the majority of cases a man's circumstances or his supposed interests determine whether he will ally himself with the cause of justice and humanity or that of crime and cruelty. The entrance into a life of wrong-doing is often so slightly divergent from the path of right that the moral nature is not aroused until some distance has been gone over. It is so with Bunyan's Pilgrim when he wanders into by-paths that seem to have the same direction as the main road and does not perceive his error until the thunders and the floods begin to threaten him. In Shakespeare, sometimes a chance friendship with him who represents the right makes it easy and natural to follow the path of duty, sometimes an innocent, if not commendable feeling, such as reverence for royalty, will lead a man into perplexities extrication from which seems almost impossible. Thus the influence of environment is fully recognized. But there are exceptions enough to this rule to prove the reality of virtue: there are men and women who, like Kent in the play of King Lear, pursue undeviatingly the course of right against the leadings of self-interest and safety. There are those also who, having been betrayed into a course of wrong-doing, take alarm when they see impending judgment, repent and with apparent sincerity seek for pardon.

It might be an interesting question whether Shakespeare was

of those who follow art for its own sake, or of those who use it for some higher end of moral instruction. That he was not much in love with his art appears both from internal evidence furnished by his works and from the fact of his early retirement from a successful career. On the other hand, he did not assume the role of the preacher, the business of the play-wright being, as he himself tells us, "to show virtue her own features, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure." Shakespeare did not count himself among those poets "whose eyes in a fine frenzy rolling do glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven." His eyes were as steady, his brain as cool, and his touch as accurate as those of any scientific observer. The passage is by no means to be taken as Shakespeare's estimate of a true poet; it is the estimate formed by a cold, matter-of-fact, materialized nature incapable of regarding poetry except with a mild contempt. We conclude, therefore, that he was led to the study of human nature by the intrinsic interest of the problem, so far as higher motives and not mere financial stress were influential. Men of science commonly profess to study material nature in this way, satisfied, they say, if they can find its immediate laws and forces. It is often difficult to rest here, when their investigations lure them powerfully on to those profounder questions that involve all existence; it is doubly difficult for the student of human nature.

But we will suppose that Shakespeare was content to stop with what he saw in humanity without theorizing, or moralizing, or showing sympathy with one type of man rather than another. What more conspicuous fact could he find than the distinction which all men make between right and wrong? If the poet is indifferent in his treatment of good and evil, his characters are not, and his hearers or readers are not. What is more profoundly interesting and certain of enlisting the sympathies than a contest between selfishness and generosity, treason and loyalty, or truth and falsehood? These are unquestionably the subjects upon which many of the plays are based. The Satanic nature of ambition could not be more powerfully portrayed by the preacher than it is by the dramatist in the story of Macbeth. Suggested and stimulated by the infernal forces of witchcraft,

ambition brings the soldierly Macbeth into a conflict with his better nature, overcomes him, makes him a murderer, hurries him into crime after crime until Scotland shudders at his name, then when the measure of his iniquities is full betrays him into the hands of the avenger of blood and drives him friendless into eternity. The baseness of filial ingratitude and the beauty of filial love are displayed in the story of King Lear and his daughters. The baleful effects of jealousy are set forth in Othello; the dehumanizing influence of avarice is shown in Shylock. The demonstration in these cases could not be more complete if the poet had announced his theme at the outset and his conclusion at the end.

But not only is the moral nature of the hearer or reader of these plays engaged and instructed by the events and passions brought before him; the working of conscience itself in the actors is powerfully exhibited. Rarely do we meet with a character so hardened as not to show some signs of remorse for his wickedness. Iago is the only one that I can recall. He gloats even in private over the success of his nefarious plots, and is stubbornly silent under taunts and blows, when at last his villainy is disclosed and his doom is evident. But he stands alone, and it is clear that his class is likewise small among the actual criminals of the world. The other villains, like most of those who come to the gallows under the law of the land, become timid and weak in the presence of their fate, whether brought before them by a ghostly visitant, by a dream which opens to them the world of spirits, or by the presence of death ready to drag them before another tribunal than that of man.

King Claudius, for instance, trembles at every pious sentiment that he hears or accidentally utters, and tries to repent of his brother's murder while holding on to the crown which that murder procured for him. How clearly his conscience proves the folly of such an attempt!

> "O what form of prayer
> Can serve my turn? Forgive me my foul murther?
> That cannot be; since I am still possessed
> Of those effects for which I did the murther,
> My crown, my own ambition and my queen.
> May one be pardoned and retain the offence?

In the corrupted currents of this world
Offence's gilded hand may shove by justice;
And oft 'tis seen the wicked prize itself
Buys out the law; but 'tis not so above:
There is no shuffling, there the action lies
In his true nature, and we ourselves compelled
Even to the teeth and forehead of our faults
To give in evidence."

This case is not solitary. The cruel and ambitious Macbeth is unnerved by the appearance of Banquo's ghost, which seems a messenger from the spirit world sent to remind him of his approaching doom. The Duke of Clarence dreams that he has passed "into the kingdom of perpetual night" and experienced the beginnings of retribution for his many crimes, and he awakes trembling at the thought of what his soul would suffer in its "immortal nakedness." His brother, King Richard III., who sounded all the depths and shoals of wickedness and hypocrisy and seemed proof against fear, also has a dream which by its effect shows how weak the boldest become in the presence of that power which uncovers and punishes guilt. He admits to his attendant that

"Shadows to night
Have struck more terror to the soul of Richard
Than can the substance of ten thousand soldiers
Armed in proof."

It is easy to believe that Shakespeare had no purpose in all this beyond that which he in Hamlet declares to be the true business of the dramatist,—"to hold the mirror up to nature." He shows us the human heart as it appears to a man of the world without any theological system to uphold. He depicts the actings of conscience, because he finds conscience as one of the components of humanity and not because he has a distinct purpose to make men better. That is precisely the chief reason why his works are so valuable, because they give a true, clear and comprehensive view of human nature without a suspicion of theological bias. Shakespeare's works are the common ground on which the skeptic and the Christian teacher may meet, and lend themselves easily to the use which St. Paul made of the heathen poets in his arguments with the Athenians; only

they are immeasurably more valuable for this purpose than all the writings of the ancients.

Shakespeare makes excursions into the religious nature of man, but he treats with perfect impartiality paganism, superstition and Christianity. Jupiter, or Fate, or God, it matters little what the supernal Power may be which is recognized in any particular age or nation, reverence for that power and the purpose to work righteousness seem to answer all the ends of piety to the dramatist. If a distinction is made between superstition and faith, it is merely such as the natural reason would make in comparing each with the wisdom and order of the material world. Hypocrisy, on the other hand, is everywhere offensive, and when discovered is treated with popular abhorrence. But neither abhorrence of hypocrisy nor reverence for piety, nor yet toleration for all creeds can be regarded as the feeling of Shakespeare, it is that of the humanity which he depicts.

This has become so generally recognized that in all disputes as to whether anything is a feature of humanity, Shakespeare is appealed to by both parties as an authority. His plays are regarded as an encyclopædia of what observation proves humanity to be, and to them we refer for illustrations of the principles of mental and moral science and for a confirmation of our belief that man is also by nature a religious being. Here certainly is reason enough why a scholar should not only have read Shakespeare, but also should cultivate a familiar acquaintance with at least his principal plays. Consequently many of our colleges find it profitable to give some time to the reading and interpretation of Shakespeare, as tending to promote both self-knowledge and the knowledge of human nature. While there are many minor advantages to be obtained—some knowledge of history, an acquaintance with our language at its best period, rhetorical skill in the analysis of figures and forms of expression—yet these should be kept distinctly subordinate to the main purpose. Thus in reading the comedies the young may be brought to look upon what is regarded as the vulgar and forbidden side of life in such a way as, when there is occasion, to transform snickering boys into self-respecting men; in reading

the tragedies they may see how virtue and vice often fail of their due rewards in this life and be led to believe as a matter of course in a future state of retribution, of which we have frequent glimpses.

Those acquainted with what is often claimed for Shakespeare will regard this as an exceedingly moderate statement of our case. It may be criticised, perhaps, as lacking enthusiasm, failing in poetic appreciation, and as taking no account of the brilliancy and wit of the dramatist. In reply it would be sufficient to say that amusement cannot be reckoned among the ends of study and therefore what contributes principally to this is properly omitted from present consideration. If I were advising the formation of Shakespeare clubs for social purposes, a different method would be suitable. Besides, while fully recognizing our debt to the poet and while trying to estimate carefully the nature of that debt, it has seemed proper to use some caution to avoid the extravagances of Shakespeare-worship.

I may be pardoned for referring a moment here at the close to the view of those who are accustomed to say that if they were to be limited for all their future life to two books, they would choose the Bible and Shakespeare. Often, indeed, we have reason to believe that such an expression is mere cant—religious cant and literary cant combined. Men too often take their impression of both books at second hand, without any hearty acquaintance with either. They have heard the expression, it sounds fine, and they repeat it as something to do credit to their insight and literary judgment. But apart from this, and without claiming that Shakespeare's plays are the highest product of human genius, I am disposed to think that the decision could hardly be found fault with. If the Bible improves our acquaintance with the will of God, Shakespeare improves our acquaintance with the mind and heart of man; and it would seem impossible for our sympathies to become narrow, even were we shut up in a cloister, with so large-hearted a companion to remind us of human ways and feelings. Perhaps the principal objection to the formula would lie in the assumption that with the Bible we would *need* any other book to keep us in sympathy with mankind. Its author has a more intimate knowl-

edge of the human heart than even Shakespeare. Besides, it is strong where he is weak; showing not only what humanity is but also what it should be; presenting not only imperfect men but also the perfect Man; not only setting before us an ideal of life and character but directing us how to attain it; giving us not only suggestions of a future retribution but a positive assurance of it. Still as men are constituted, the entrance into the religious life is often easiest through the secular, and the confirmation of faith comes more acceptably through flashes of our every-day life than through a set treatise of the divine. In view, then, of the light shed by Shakespeare's works upon our social, mental, moral and religious nature, and because of the additional fact that a certain class of persons would be more ashamed to acknowledge ignorance of those works than of the Bible itself, it seems to me that they are eminently worthy of the attention of the Christian student.

---

## ARTICLE III.

### JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH AND THE CHRISTIAN IDEA.

By Prof. S. Sprecher, D. D., LL. D., Springfield, O.

The Christian salvation is the possession and enjoyment of the good, of the highest good, of the good which man lost in the fall, and for which the human heart, even in its spiritual alienation from it and in its habitual pursuit of other good, has still more or less longing, as is manifest in its dissatisfaction and restlessness in all that it pursues and all that it attains. Through Christianity the good comes in contact with man in all the living unity of his person, affecting all the phases and processes of his life. It touches him at every point, his susceptibility and his receptivity, his activity and productivity, his rational and his ethical capacity. But we have here to deal with the Christian idea only as it relates to the subject in his personal relation to God in Christ, in his living relation to the religious consciousness as it has been affected by the Christian revelation. It is the Christian consciousness including more than the common

consciousness, more than the mere results of the influence of the external world of nature and of the action of the mind upon itself, and the inferences which it may draw from these impressions. It is the Christian idea as it is revealed in the light of the divine revelation given in the sacred Scriptures, and realized in the ethico-religious process of saving faith. All conceptions of God and man, all conclusions drawn from nature alone are recognized by the Christian idea in the light of divine revelation and apprehended through the religious experience involved in saving faith.

Other knowledge of God and man and nature, however true and rational it may be, belongs respectively to speculative philosophy, to rational psychology and to natural science. It is only through the Bible and in this ethico-religious relation, that the nature of God and the faculties of man and the laws of nature become the proper subjects of true Christian thought. It is only as they are connected with the divine revelation, with communion of God with man, with the communication of His saving blessing to human souls, with the establishment, preservation and triumph of his kingdom, with the manifestation of his glory, that these cognitions become elements of the Christian idea. And in this way the Christian idea revealed by the Scriptures is apprehended in the intuitions inseparable from saving faith. "Through faith we understand that worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which do appear."

Thus many declarations and intimations of the Scriptures themselves concerning, for instance, the angelic world become elements of the Christian idea only in their connection with saving faith. From an extended view of Christ and his kingdom the Christian idea may indeed be made to include the conception that not only his creative but his redemptive work embraces the whole universe of being, of nature as well as of spirit, the entire world of angels as well as that of man. The accomplishment of God's final purpose to reveal his glory in the life of all rational existences and to communicate his blessedness to his universal kingdom of spirits made for communion with him, may be extended to "the higher ranks of the angelic world" and

regarded as designed to gather "into the unity of a universal kingdom all the tribes of holy intelligences." It may be said that "the Christian Scriptures represent the whole Godhead as active and participant in the creative as well as the redemptive plan and work;" that "Christ is not only Head of the church but Head of all principality and power, of everything that can be named, not only in this but in the world to come;" that "the goal of the universe is the gathering together in him as the Head of all things in heaven and earth;" that "the history of the world is precisely the history of redemption."

All this is very reasonable and very accordant with Scripture. But it is not an essential element of the Christian idea. The work of redemption certainly has relations to the high and holy order of beings in the world of angels. It is true that "Christ is its centre and end," and that "not only are all things in him and 'through him,' but all things 'consist in him,' and that his conserving energy supports all things and directs them to their destination." But redemption with those unfallen, holy angels is not redemption from sin. Their reconciliation with God does not require an atonement for sin and guilt. Of the nature of their sense of redemption, of their interest in the work of salvation, we have no experience. They are reconciled without the substitution of the righteousness of another for their justification. They are brought to their destination without being first released from sin, while we are reconciled by vicarious atonement, and saved only by restoration from sin to holiness. They enjoy the same good which we possess; but with them it was never lost, while with us it is a good lost through sin, and restored by redemption. The essential element therefore of the Christian idea as revealed in the Scriptures and apprehended in the experience of saving faith is the *atonement;* it is Christ as "the lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," as "the propitiation for sin through faith in his blood." Of this we have the sure declarations of revelation and the clear intuitions springing from saving faith. Whatever, therefore, may be the connection with us of unfallen moral beings in the one plan and work of redemption and in the one great Head of all things, and however closely they may be associated with us in the rev-

elation, administration and appropriation of the blessings of his kingdom, and however important to us may, in many respects, be the knowledge of their existence and their association with us in the movement and consummation of his kingdom, still the Christian idea is specifically that of *redemption from sin*, of justification for the guilty, and of their renewal unto holiness and life, on the ground of *vicarious atonement.* The former is, indeed, connected remotely with the plan of salvation; but the latter are the immediate subjects of its operation, as it is made known from heaven and verified by experience in this *fallen* world. The centre of the Christian idea is the Gospel as "the *power* of God unto salvation to every one that *believeth*," and it is the *assurance* of salvation through *faith* in Christ.

So it is perfectly consistent with the Christian idea, and with the sacred Scriptures to suppose that as Christ is the centre of the creative as well as of the redemptive work, the perfecter of the universe as well as the Saviour of the sinner, he would for the completion of the created world, have become incarnate even if sin had not entered it. From numerous hints of the Scriptures and from the manifest truth that the perfecting of creation, the consummation of all things will be inseparable from the incarnation of the Son of God which has actually taken place; it may, as a probable truth, be inferred that it would have been necessary to the accomplishment of this end, even if sin had not entered the world; that the perfect revelation of God to the creature, the full manifestation of his excellent glory in the works of his hand, and the free communication of his holy love to his personal creatures, and his actual communion with intelligent but finite beings could only be made through this means. Still this is only a probable inference; it is not a *necessary* conclusion either from rational considerations or scriptural declarations. Whether the absolutely perfect revelation of himself to the creature could not have been made, and the end of its being attained without the incarnation of the Logos in a continuous innocent and unfallen state of the world, we cannot *certainly* say. There are strong reasons for it, and it is of great apologetic value as the proof of it would make the incarnation as certain as the existence of the Creator and the crea-

ture. That it would have been necessary to the complete manifestation of the glorious attributes of God, to the highest perfection of his creatures, and to the final consummation of his kingdom is a *well-grounded speculation* in a rational theology. But that an incarnation would thus have been *necessary* to the absolutely perfect divine revelation and to the completed existence of the creature does not follow from the fact that these ends are *now* accomplished through the actual incarnation revealed in the sacred Scriptures and cognized as *necessary to our salvation* in the intuitions of faith.

We know from Scripture and from experience that there has been an atonement made for sinful men and that to such an atonement the incarnation was necessary because in the person of the Atoner there would have to be a personal union of divinity and humanity, of God and man. But as sin was not a *necessary* result of creation, we cannot say that a divine incarnation would have been *necessary* to the completion of the creative work of God. We can only say that if he would *save sinful* men, if he would *bring fallen* creatures to the end for which he had made them, if he would make atonement for their sins, the divine incarnation which *actually occurred was a necessity.* It would be a necessary element in the plan of salvation for a *fallen* world. Probable and Scriptural as the conception of a divine incarnation even in that continuance of the unfallen state which was possible, in that innocent condition of created beings which might have been perpetual; yet it is not a *necessary* inference of reason nor a *clear* declaration of Scripture. It does not enter into the experience of the believer, and as the Gospel speaks only of the incarnation in view of the necessity of the atonement, of the propitiatory sacrifice necessary to be made for sin, and as it declares that the specific object of Christ's advent was to *save sinners*, it is essential to the Christian idea that we fix our minds especially upon the *atonement* as the great reason for, and the direct object of, the incarnation. The fact that the perfecting of the created universe is *now* accomplished through the same agency which has redeemed it from sin, that the *completion* as well as the restoration of the universe of being is through Christ, and is accomplished in connection with the

process of salvation from sin, does indeed magnify the scheme of redemption and add glory to the person and work of the incarnate Son of God. But it does not prove that his incarnation would have been a *necessity* involved in the very creation itself, in the actual perfecting of even an unfallen world; for as there was no necessity that there should be sin, we cannot say that the incarnation is involved in the very existence and government of the world. The necessity of atonement for sin, and consequently of the incarnation to the salvation and perfection of sinners is involved in justification by faith in Christ. It is the basis of the peace and joy and hope of the believer, and is included in the assurance of salvation which the Gospel proclaims and which the Holy Spirit communicates. The recognition of the *necessity of the atonement* as involving the incarnation of the Son of God, and of the fact that this *necessity was met by our blessed Saviour* is the fundamental feature of the Christian idea. It may be that the end of the creation of rational beings simply as contemplating the union of Creator and creature, would, even in a sinless development, have involved the incarnation, though not the sufferings of its great Author and Head. But we have no experience of the unfallen state of man, no personal observation of the sinless life of holy angels, and consequently we can have no intuitions of the necessities involved in simple created existence itself; or of the extent of the divine work necessary for the preservation and progress in holiness of rational creatures where sin has not entered; for the perfection of creatures who may have transcended the possibility of sin involved in their moral freedom by the actual choice of holiness. We cannot infer it as a rational necessity of a divine incarnation, as involved in the very idea of creation, and consequently, for the consummation of even sinless existence. On the other hand we have experience of the sinful state of creatures, and consequently we have an intuition of the *necessity of the actual incarnation* of the Son of God accomplished in the *person of Jesus Christ* for our salvation from sin, because the union of the divine and human natures in the person of him who could suffer for sin and at the same time "be able to save to the uttermost," could be secured only by such divine incar-

nation. And the prominence and emphasis which the Gospel and the believer's experience give to the atonement require us for the foundation of the Christian idea to fix our view specifically upon the incarnation of the Son of God *as necessary for the purpose of the atonement made for sin, for the reconciliation of sinful men to God.*

The perfecting of the human nature is indeed an actual result of the incarnation, but this takes place through its restoration from sin. The prime conception of the Christian idea is that of the salvation assured by the Gospel and experienced by the believer; the blessedness of restoration to holiness, the enjoyment of the good lost through sin. It is derived *mainly* from *those representations* of Scripture which relate to the reconciliation of the *fallen* race, and consists of the conceptions thus produced in the consciousness of the Church universal in the course of the Christian realization of the union of God with us in Christ. This is the great subject-matter of the Christian revelation. It begins with the good in creation, gives an account of the loss of it by the fall of man, describes the method of its restoration in the salvation of individual souls and the establishment of the kingdom of God in the world. It begins and ends with Paradise. It begins with Eden where God walked and talked with man while in the innocent enjoyment of the good, and it closes with Paradise restored, with the new Jerusalem where God again dwells with men, where they "need not the light of sun or moon, but of which the Lord God and the Lamb are the light for ever," where they will have entire exemption from all evil and complete enjoyment of all good.

And while this inspired history produces saving faith, it at the same time enriches the Christian idea with new conceptions of the universe of being—of the nature of God and man. It prepares the mind to apprehend the trinity of the divine existence, the attributes of the Godhead, and the spiritual capacities of man. The nature of sin and redemption revealed in the Gospel and experienced in saving faith involve, at least, in their economical relations, if not in their metaphysical aspects, the Christian conceptions of the divine personality, attributes and trinity.

And though not comprehended in their transcendent nature, they are, in the fact of justification by faith, clearly apprehended as realities in the divine existence; and this not merely as the anthropopathical mode of our apprehending God, but as his mode of revealing himself. The Christian idea conceives of him as being actually in his inherent nature that which he has revealed himself to be, to be really that which he appears to be in the biblical representations. In their metaphysical aspects these truths are neither comprehensible nor demonstrable. But the Christian idea does not require this: it is satisfied with the fact that they have their origin in the revelation given in the Scriptures; that they are involved in the experience of justification by faith; that they have been received by the Church in all ages; and that they are not inconsistent with the true laws of human thought, nor with any just inferences from the facts of natural science. The Christian idea accepts the Christian revelation neither as a mere symbol of reality which must pass away before the light of science, nor as a lower form of truth destined to vanish in the course of the rational development of mind and the natural evolution of matter, but as the manifestation of realities additional to all that nature and mind have disclosed, as higher and more lasting than any thing which they can produce. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen."

Together with the intuitions of the inherent dignity, and power of Christ, inseparable from saving faith, the Christian idea includes a sense of the *absolute necessity* of this mediation for our salvation, of the moral wrong in sin, of the holiness of God, of the responsibility of man as a personal being who, in the exercise of his freedom, could sin. Together with the realization of the *sufficiency* of the propitiatory sacrifice of the Son of God, it embraces the scriptural representations of divinity and humanity, and of the union of the divine and the human natures in the one person of Christ. And as it involves the conception of a real contact of God with man through his word and Spirit, it apprehends the advent of the Holy Spirit, the spiritual nature of the Church, the consummation of the kingdom of Christ in the human soul, and over the entire universe; the res-

urrection of the bodies of men; the final judgment of mankind, and the eternal blessedness of his people. And the experience of the fact of justification by faith in Christ alone leads to the acceptance of all these contents of the Christian idea as they have been evolved in the Christian consciousness under the light of the sacred Scriptures and expressed in the Œcumenical Creeds of the Church and in the principal symbols of the great Reformation.

It involves, for instance, the *personality* of the divine existence. For if God were not a personal being, the evil which is in the world would not be sin. It would not be alienation from God, but a *phase in the evolution of his own being.* It would not be the transgression of moral law, and would not involve the guilt and condemnation which the experience of justification by faith requires us to recognize as its distinguishing characteristic. Faith recognizes the reality of the scriptural representations of God as simple and uncompounded yet holding all elements of actual as well as of all possible being, and all powers of life and spirit in eternal and indisputable union. In him are all the fulness and all the distinctions of perfect being. The homogeneity and heterogeneity in the created universe are, in him, the unity of one life, of one harmonious spirit, of one holy love. In him distinctions are not separations, differences not antagonisms, diversities not antitheses. In him there is no *evolution*, no struggle, no conflict, but unity and plurality, homogeneity and heterogeneity are simultaneous, independent of time, from eternity to eternity. In the creature, though made in the image of God, the existence is derived and subject to time. In it homogeneity and heterogeneity are not simultaneous. In created being there is *evolution;* first homogeneity, then heterogeneity, and finally the union of the two. But as such existence is in the successions of time the evolution is never complete, the unity never perfect, the fulness of being never realized, the life never a perfect harmony or perfect love, until it be brought into union with God and becomes a partaker of the divine life. If innocent and unfallen, it still has its goal to attain in the divine likeness; if sinful and depraved, it must be reconciled and renewed by divine grace. It must be brought back to God through God. In

its perfection and blessedness of being God must be "all in all" as well as "over all."

God is "the Father Almighty," "the one divine essence, which is called and is God, eternal, incorporeal, indivisible, infinite in power, wisdom, and goodness." He is the good, the unity of the rational and the free, of that which ought to be and that which must be, of that which is freely chosen and of that which necessarily is. In his underived immutable being is the union of eternal intelligence and eternal freedom. His existence is eternally necessary and eternally free, because it is absolute perfection of being, absolute spirit eternally realized, moral being in the absolute perfection of existence, the ethical, the imperative existence. It is being in its absolute rationality and necessity, its absolute spirituality and liberty, its absolute authority and excellence. He is holy love, the highest, not in comparison with other beings, but absolutely supreme; not merely in knowledge and power, but especially in ethical goodness; eternal, yet self-existent; necessary, yet free; omnipotent and omniscient, yet self-controlled; holy and unchangeable good will, yet will in liberty, self-producing and self-possessing, self-preserving and self-communicating; from eternity to eternity, using all intelligence and power. It is the *all-wise, almighty free will* to which all is in subordination and subjection.

The good is not mere natural existence, because a mere nature-object must always be referred for its origin and end to some being other than itself. It has no inherent dignity, no worthiness which makes its very existence imperative and inviolable. It is that which may be used for other ends than, and irrespective of its own, which has not its end in itself, and which has no proper claim to the commanding and controlling of other being. The good is ethical existence; it is spirit. It is that which faith recognizes as the summit of existence, as the source and end of all existence, that to which all Christian faith necessarily comes, and beyond which the Christian mind does not desire to go. And no rational thought can transcend it. It is that which ought to be and which nevertheless must be. It is absolutely the prius. In God it is eternal, independent of time; in the creature it is derived and successive and must be referred

to the Creator of all for its origin. It is that back of which the Christian faith, in its experience of the authoritative in the good, does not permit the Christian idea to venture. It is at the top of all being, and to ask a reason for its existence would be to deny its nature, namely that it is the absolutely imperative. In saving faith the mind cannot but acknowledge it, and in recognizing it, must shut out all question concerning its reality, all demanding of the reason of its existence. So surely as conscience is felt to be a reality by the believer, so surely does he cognize the reality of moral, spiritual being; so surely as he recognizes "the categorical imperative" within him, so surely does he know spirit as distinct from matter, and as transcending, though it comprehends all mere nature-objects. The spiritual is distinguishable from the merely natural; the imperative is above the merely useful. The ethical is higher than the merely physical, sentient or even intelligent being. Otherwise it could not be recognized by faith, as is done, in its repentance and confidence, as the absolutely imperative, the absolutely controlling. In other realities we may always put the question: For what purpose is this? Yea even in regard to conscious existence we may ask: Why this thinking, this sentient, this voluntary power? And there is but one absolutely satisfactory answer, but one reason which can, and, in the Christian mind, does put an end to all further questioning, and this lies in the very nature of the idea of the ethical. Its nature is such that the moment it is apprehended at all every further inquiry must cease. If, when we seemed to conceive of it, there were still in the mind the possibility to ask a reason why it is, this of itself would show that the conception was a mere illusion, and that we had not really apprehended the ethical in its characteristic nature. For the only rational answer to the inquiry after the reason of any other existence is that it is *right* that it should be, showing that the *ethical* is always presupposed. The absolute good is not only that which ought to be, but that which cannot but be. It is therefore the first cause and the final cause, the original source and the sufficient reason of all being. Whenever this reality is conceived of at all, it is recognized as that which is in itself *the good*, the absolutely worthy. This idea of

absolutely worthy being as absolute personality, as eternally self-conscious and self-determined existence, the experience of faith presents to the thinking mind, as well as to the sentient heart, as its final point of repose and its supreme source of satisfaction. God's being is moral, spiritual, personal existence. In him there is not merely eternal being, but self-action and self-law, pure spontaneity and pure autonomy, personal, self-existence from eternity, independent of all space and time and of all finite forms of being. In him there is not a mere becoming—an ever becoming and never actually existing, but both action and law are eternally realized in the unity of absolute reason and absolute freedom, the holy, perfect life of personal spirit.

The fact of justification by faith agrees also with the declaration of the Creed that God is "the Creator of heaven and earth." Saving faith necessarily presupposes or views God as *Creator*, because it is faith in God as *Redeemer*. Redemption presupposes the existence of evil, and evil presupposes the existence of *the good*. Without the existence of the good evil could not become a reality. Evil could not have come into being if the good had not first been. Nor could it occur in the *uncreated* good which is absolute and unchangeable. It could find opportunity to exist only in the *created* good which is dependent and mutable. Moreover redemption cannot come from the good which was liable to sin and in which evil has become a reality. The creature could become a sinner, but it could not be a savior. Faith in Christ, the faith which saves, is faith in God as *Redeemer*, and this presupposes faith in him as *Creator*. The Christian salvation is the restoration, and through this, the completion of the created good. It implies a primitive uncreated good: for evil is not eternal—is not from eternity; it is not in God; it must have had a beginning—a beginning in time; and it must have originated in a created good. There must therefore be a *creature-existence*, a real existence of that which did not exist from eternity, but which began in time—of that which is created. Hence God must for the Christian idea be Creator. Evil cannot belong to the primitive existence; for them redemption would be the evolution of the divine nature itself, which, as we have seen is excluded by the idea of the personality of

God. Faith recognizes the Redeemer as the restorer of that which has fallen from God, and which is not God himself, nor any form or movement of his being. Nor is evil the work of creation. It is not an element in created being; does not belong to the essence of the creature—not even in germ. It is not even an element in the idea of created being as such. It is only a possibility when the good already exists—only a possibility in created beings endowed with freedom; a possibility which, though it has become a reality, needed not, and ought not to have become actual. It is not a substance, and consequently cannot have been the work of creation, as only a substance can come from the creative hand. Evil therefore, though it has become a reality, is only a possibility incidental to the existence of free creatures. The possibility, but *not* the *reality* of sin was necessary in the existence of a created moral world. It belongs not to the primitive creation of either physical or spiritual existences; it is not inherent in a primitive material; nor was it in the original constitution of nature or man. It is a perversion of that which was created good; it is a bad state of that which is in itself good; it is a wrong relation of the creature, resulting from the abuse of freedom. It was only a possibility which has become a reality in the existing world through the *voluntary abuse of the freedom with which the moral creature is necessarily endowed.* The good only exists from eternity; and from the hand of creation nothing but good could come. "God is not tempted of evil, neither tempteth he any man. Every good gift, and every perfect gift cometh down from the Father of lights in whom is neither variableness nor shadow of turning." Thus does the fact of justification by faith exclude from the Christian idea all Pantheism, all confounding of God and the world, of creator and creature, and enforce the idea of God as the personal creator of the world in the strictest sense.

And so it shuts out all Dualism—all ideas or views of evil which make it eternal or self-existent; or a substance, something inhering in the very nature of things, as a necessary antagonism of existences, as the dark back-ground of the being of the good. Saving faith necessarily distinguishes the world from God. Teaching and experiencing that sin is guilt, it re-

cognizes it as a reality that cannot be ascribed to him, either as to his nature or his work. And in ascribing sin to man, it acknowledges not only his dependence, but also his *freedom;* it makes him a morally responsible being; and, as a consequence, necessarily recognizes him as having a distinct personal existence. Having as its great fundamental pre-supposition the moral alienation of humanity through sin, it necessarily heightens the conception and deepens the sense of the distinction between the holy God and the sinful world. In a word, it necessarily suggests the idea of the Divine Being as the absolutely good—of his supreme justice and his holy majesty, of his transcendent existence and his righteous self-preservation. Sin must therefore have its origin in the creature. And as it had a temporal beginning, it may be brought to an end in the being of a free creature. The Gospel communicates the forgiveness of sin and promises its extermination in those who accept it, and the believer, being justified through faith, enjoys peace with God and possesses the hope of final deliverance from all sin. The fact of justification is not merely an approximation to deliverance without any actual attainment of it; but it is the experience of a present salvation, and the hope of a final and perfect restoration to holiness, in complete communion with God as the primitive good and the author of all good.

But as the fact of justification through faith is the actual communication and reception of the good—of eternal life—it leads to the recognition of the immanence of God in the world as well as of his transcendence over it. His infinite holiness is indeed supreme self-love. But it is holy love, and this is not opposed to the love of other being. Whilst absolute excellence, and the best of being, must require the highest love of itself, this is not inconsistent with love to other being—being which may be possible. God's love to himself must be supreme, because he is the most excellent of all beings actual or possible. Love therefore embraces everything in himself in righteous self-preservation. But God's love is of moral character. Like his existence, it is free, though it is necessary. This love to himself does not limit his activity to himself—to his own actual being—does not imprison himself in his necessary transcendence

of the creature, either as a possible or an actual existence. It is perfectly consistent with the self-communication involved in calling into actual existence a possible world of other beings, and with his immanency in it; perfectly consistent with his loving not only the good which he eternally and actually is in himself, independently of all other existence, but with this also all the possible good which he may be able to make actual. His love is perfectly *consistent with his being Creator.* His supreme love of himself is no hindrance to his being the Father of creatures, the Giver of all good and perfect gifts. The experience of faith is that the divine good is inexhaustible. No amount of participation in it can diminish it. The number of participants can never be so great that there will not be enough for all—for Creator and creature. Though free, it will be wherever there is want of it, and capacity for it. God *is Creator.* While he preserves himself, he communicates out of the fulness of all good to other beings—called into existence by his wise and holy love —all possible good. This union of self-maintenance and self-communication—of love to self and love to others, is the highest good, the perfection of existence. In this, it has been well said, "that withholding doth not enrich, nor giving impoverish."

> "The highest good
> Unlimited, ineffable, doth so speed
> To love, as beam to lucid body darts,
> Giving as much of ardor as it finds,
> The sempiternal effluence streams abroad—
> So that the more aspirants to that bliss
> Are multiplied, more good is there to love,
> And more is loved; as mirrors that reflect
> To each other propagated light."

This is true of love among creatures according to the experience of saving faith; and it makes practicable the apprehension of the Scriptures and the Church, that God is free and loving Creator, that while he does not lose himself in giving existence to beings other than himself, he does call into actual being creatures distinct from himself, and yet communicate himself to them in all his communicable fulness of life and blessedness.

But the fact of justification by faith in Christ, agrees also with

the declaration of the Creed that God is not only the Creator, but also "the Preserver of all things visible and invisible." And while, on the one hand, it shuts out all Pantheism and Dualism, it rejects on the other all forms of Deism—all deistic ideas, all those views of the universe which, while they recognize God as the original author of the world, yet so separate between Creator and creature as to make God to have no communion or union with the works of his hand; to exercise no providence, to have no watchful care over them; to hear no prayer, to bestow no blessing; to be shut up in his transcendent existence with no immanence in the world; to make no revelation of himself to the rational, moral beings he has made. Against all unbelieving agnosticism—all infidel inferences from nature, and all views of the uniformity of natural law—which lead men to deny that we may recognize the hand of God in our life or trust in the presence of a particular divine providence in the affairs of men—saving faith delights in the language of the catechism: "I believe that God hath created me and all that exists; that he hath given and still preserves to me my body and my soul, with all their members and faculties, and all that I possess; that he richly and daily provides me with all the necessaries and enjoyments of life; that he guards me from danger and preserves me from evil; wholly induced by divine paternal love and mercy, without any claim of merit or worthiness in me; for which I am in duty bound to thank, praise, serve and obey him;—this is most certainly true." And against all views of the divine attributes and government—which shut out the idea of God's immediate operations upon us and in us, of the reality of our communion with him in all good designs and works, of the fact that we have actual intercourse with him in prayer, of the truth "that he is," and "that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him"—the experience of saving faith prepares the mind for the inspired apprehension that God "is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us." It prepares us to feel the peculiar propriety of the Saviour's beginning his work of bringing us into communion with God in him with the enforcement of belief in a special providence, with the declaration that the very

"hairs of our head are all numbered." The God recognized in saving faith is *the good, is love.* It is participant in the true blessedness, in the good which comes from reconciliation and union with God. "The love of God shed abroad in the heart" is the present enjoyment, of "the life of God in the soul," and the earnest of an eternal life with him. This partaking of the good, this "rejoicing with joy unspeakable and full of glory," may indeed be distinguished from all mere enjoyment of created good. The latter is mere happiness, and is limited to the temporal, the lower forms of good; the former is true blessedness and refers to the spiritual, the eternal, the highest good; the latter is for the sense and the understanding; the former for the reason and the spirit in communion with the Holy and the Good. But the spiritual power which produces this blessedness controls all other things. To the faith which seeks first "the kingdom of God and his righteousness," the expectation necessarily comes that "all these things shall be added." Man in communion with God through faith feels that he possesses the unlimited good in which all the susceptibilities of the heart are satisfied in ever-increasing fulness. But from this central power, he realizes also that all the faculties of the intellect may be exercised with unhindered effect; all the powers of the will put forth in loving harmony; all the works of his hand produced with living energy; because he lives under the government of an all-wise and particular providence. In this state, in which God and his kingdom have become to the spirit the supreme good, "the one thing needful," "the good part which shall never be taken from" him, he feels that all his capacities of soul and body must finally be brought to their teleological perfection, and heartily adopts the sentiments of the Church of all ages when she sings:

> "We are his people, we his care,
> Our souls and all our mortal frame."

And when he contemplates the saving work of Christ in its comprehensive bearings, he exclaims:

> "Wide as the world is thy command;
> Vast as eternity thy love;
> Firm as a rock thy truth must stand,
> When rolling years shall cease to move."

The fact of justification by faith prepares us to apprehend the truth that all things, the physical and temporal as well as the spiritual and eternal, the small as well as the great, are included in the plan of grace, and are governed in the interest of the work of redemption. It leads us to realize the true meaning and the significant emphasis of the Saviour's admonition to implicit trust in divine providence. It is so much in point as a divine admonition as well as a rational cognition inseparable from saving faith that we cannot refrain from quoting it in full: "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body more than raiment? Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature? And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow. They toil not, neither do they spin. And yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (for after all these things do the *Gentiles* seek); for your heavenly father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." How naturally does faith in the saving power of Christ thus lead to the rejection of the heathen idea of the impersonality of the deity and the Gentile seeking after nature-worship and nature-help, and require the apprehension of a personal creator, preserver and ruler of the world—of the personal providential care of "the Father of spirits," as enforced by the teaching of that Saviour.

Justification through faith in Christ alone prepares the mind for the apprehension of God in his personal sovereignty. It suggests necessarily the conception of true religion as a personal relation to God. *Authority over persons can be exercised only by a person.* As he is a person he can be not only Creator but Preserver and *Ruler* of the personal creature. He can come

and does come into personal relations with moral beings and governs all things for the accomplishment of their destination. As he is a personal creator, his righteous self-preservation does not prevent his divine condescension to the world which he has made, nor the manifestation of his great love and tender mercy to his dependent creatures. His transcendence above the world does not hinder his immanence in it. This transcendence and self-maintenance are indeed necessary to the possibility of his immanence in, and his self-communication to his creatures. For it is only because, through his perfect self-consciousness and his perfect self-love, his absolute self-possession and his absolute self-control, that he can communicate himself without, either absorbing all his works in his own being, or losing himself in existences other than his own. If he did not possess himself, he could not give himself to others; if he lost himself, he could not communicate himself. His love would not be a holy moral communication, but a mere physical diffusion of himself as the Emanistic theories conceive of him. The Christian's having experienced the reality of the divine communication necessarily requires his recognition of the divine sovereignty. God can and does communicate all his fulness except his self-existent and independent being. It is this power to maintain itself in all its communications which gives to love its ethical *character*, its supreme *worth*, its adorable excellence. Distinguished as of spiritual dignity, as power other than blind force or brute impulse, or animal craving, it must have the worthiness of self-preservation in the midst of all its communications. God is not only the best of beings, but the author of all other beings; the best, not in comparison with others, but absolutely; the author of all others, not as mere omnipotent power, but as *holy*, *good*, *free will*. He must necessarily be in himself the absolutely supreme being, and must maintain his absolute supremacy over all the creatures which his hand has made. The distinction between him and them is that they are a derived good while he is the eternal self-existent, underived good; they are dependent, he independent; they exist by his will, he of himself; they have not the cause of their existence in themselves, he is self-produced—exists from self eternally; they exist from him and for

him, he exists from himself and for himself; they have the cause and end of their being only in him; he has the cause and end of existence in himself. His boundless love gives existence to spiritual creatures, and creates a material universe for their sake. The supreme existence, precisely because it is independent of all temporal conditions, can come and does come into time; and though it maintains itself, it communicates of its infinite fulness to created existence. Though absolute in its own excellence, it creates finite spirits in its own image, and forms nature-objects in space and time to subserve an endless purpose—a spiritual end. And it brings nature with all its forces material and mental into being in order to minister to the high destination of spirit. This sense of the high worth and excellence of spiritual existence, as it is revealed to the experience of saving faith through divine inspiration, says emphatically: "God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands: neither is worshiped with men's hands, as though he needed anything, seeing that he giveth to all life and health and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitations; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he is not far from every one of us; for in him we live and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, for we are also his offspring."

Such a recognition of God not only as creator and preserver, but in his personal acts as the *Ruler* of his creatures is inseparable from true Christian experience. It is an idea necessarily springing from saving faith as produced by divine revelation—a conception which will always be evolved sooner or later in the truly believing mind. It is only thus that it can apprehend God in his *perfect goodness and truth.* An impersonal idea is not that of the good. It must be personal being, intelligent, conscious love, self-communicating as well as self-preserving, perfectly blessed and perfectly benevolent, self-conscious and self-determining; self-sustaining, while it communicates itself to the creature; giving itself to the rational soul, and at the same time

maintaining itself in it, by the manifestation of favor or disfavor, in final salvation or condemnation, according as the creature yields itself to it, or resists its claims to reverence and love. Saving faith does not allow us to regard God and the world as separate existences. They are distinct but not separate from each other; for while God could exist without creatures, they cannot exist a moment without him. God, the good, is not only in the underived but also in the derived existence. Faith contemplates the good not only in the primitive self-sufficient being, and not only in the original existence of the creature, in innocence and righteousness; but also in the final restoration of man and the consummation of the universe. It views it as involved in the good as eternal and real in the divine existence; as eternally in the idea of God as creator, preserver, redeemer and ruler; and as designed to be realized in the origination and completion of the created world. The Christian faith develops, on the one hand, the idea of the distinction between God and the world to its highest point and on the other, that of the union of creator and creature in its deep and mysterious depth. It recognizes the distinction not merely as manifest in the nature and existence of God as including what belongs to him, and can belong to no other being, namely self-existence, absolute personality, absolute self-consciousness and absolute self-determination, absolute power and independent life; but as manifest also in his creating all other beings and perpetually preserving and governing them. At the same time it recognizes in this divine sovereignty, this self-possession and self-control, the possibility of his communicating himself without losing himself, of creating without being absorbed in the work of his hands, of communicating his life to the creature and yet maintaining it. The ethico-religious process in saving faith requires the mind to accept the biblical representations both of the distinction and the union between God and man. If there were, on the one hand, no distinction between God and man; if all being were identical, all divine or all human, there could be none of the experience of religious faith; no *sense of moral obligation*, no consciousness of sin and guilt, no feeling of the necessity of a holy personal life, no hope of a personal immortality, in short none of the elements

of saving faith. If, on the other hand, there were no practicable union between creator and creature; if they were not merely different in their being, but separate from each other, with no relations between them, there could be no room for the ethical experience and action involved in faith; no *sense* of *absolute dependence*, no spring of moral action, no hope of the life of God in the soul. But they are *so distinct* that man is under moral obligation; and *so related* that God is the constant source of all good to man, so distinct from each other and yet so related that the believer can say: "I am crucified yet I live; nevertheless not I but Christ liveth in me, and the life that I now live, I live by the faith of the son of God." The creator of man, though not bound by any necessity other than his own excellence of being, is rational and ethical will; free, and yet eternal; immutable, because perfect; ever acting in accordance with his own infinite worthiness of being, rejoicing in absolutely holy life. And he reveals in his working, in creation and providence, grace and redemption—through the existence and government of the creature derived from him—the ethical perfection which is underived in his being and eternally realized in his absolutely holy life. The good is ethical, and consequently Christian faith recognizes its obligation, and the practicability, on the one hand, of the distinct existence, and on the other of the spiritual union between God and man.

And so the fact of justification through faith prepares the mind for the apprehension of the scriptural doctrine of the trinity of the Godhead. Involving, as it does, the union of the holy God with the sinful man, it leads to the hearty acceptance of the doctrine of the distinction in the divine existence, which the Church, under the influence of the sacred Scriptures and Christian experience, expresses in the creed when, to the confession of "the one divine essence," it adds the declaration: "That there are three persons who are of the same essence and power, and are co-eternal, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." The experience of salvation involves this threefold idea. In the experience of our lost condition, in the conviction of sin and the repentance inseparable from saving faith, we become sensible of a real alienation from God, of an actual antagonism with him,

and of the reaction of his divine holiness in the manifestation of the divine displeasure resting upon us, and consequently we perceive that this distinction of persons in the divine existence, though incomprehensible to the understanding, is a necessary conception for the reason—necessary to the possibility of that union of holiness and love, of justice and mercy, manifested in the incarnation and sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and experienced in the forgiveness of sin and the adoption of fallen man into the family of God. Thus we find ourselves in a state of antagonism with God as our creator. We are against him in our sinfulness, and he against us in his holiness. The God through whom we have existence is the judge who in his justice demands satisfaction for sin or the destruction of our life. But we also become conscious in saving faith that the God who made us is a reconciler of sinful men, making atonement for our guilt. We thus have the idea, not merely of different modes of the revelation of one and the same divine subject, but that of a distinction in the Godhead of a two-fold subject. And we are conscious also that the subjective appropriation as well as the objective accomplishment of the atonement is not our work, but the act of God. And yet it is not the operation of God as reconciling, nor of God as reconciled, but of God as dwelling in us. Thus there is distinguishable in saving faith, the God with whom, and the God by whom, and the God in whom we are reconciled. In the restoration of the good which was lost through sin there are manifested the distinctions in the Godhead, of the God who is reconciled to us, the God who is reconciling himself to us, and the God who is uniting us to himself. God himself dwells in us and witnesses in us of the reconciling God out of us, through whom the high and holy God whose justice condemned us, becomes the reconciled God, the Father who receives us as beloved children. And though it involves an unfathomable mystery, saving faith prepares us to subscribe the declaration of the creed in using "the term person in the same sense in which it is employed by ecclesiastical writers on this subject; to signify, not a part, or a quality of something else, but that which subsists of itself." Though incomprehensible to the understanding,

these distinctions are made real to the mind through that faith in which there is assurance of salvation.

Christianity being the revelation of the union between God and man, has its culmination in the conception of God, as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In it we have that idea of God, as a *living* being, which shuts out all those notions of the divine eternity and immutability, the divine omniscience and omnipotence which are inconsistent with the personal being of God and his *living* relations to his rational creatures. While it is a light which cannot itself be comprehended, it brings many other truths to clearer view and more impressive apprehension. It makes us reject as defective or erroneous all conceptions of God which are inconsistent with implicit belief in his providence over the works of his hand. It confirms all that the Old Testament says of him as the *living personal* God, as the God of justice and mercy. This union of holiness and love, this enforcement of the holy claims of God, by the "righteous Father," and the voluntary recognition and fulfilment of them by the propitiating Son; this revelation of the union of eternal necessity and eternal freedom in the divine existence by the Holy Spirit, in causing this holy love, this union of the right and the free, of the necessity manifested in the law and the "freedom wherewith the Son makes free," to be realized—in a derived way—in the experience and character of the obedient subject of saving grace, will always dispose the believing mind to accept the doctrine of the Trinity. The necessity of these distinctions is so involved in the idea of the atonement that the Christian mind will always, at last, agree with the confession in rejecting the views of those "who while they contend for the existence of only one person, subtilely and impiously affirm of the Word and the Holy Spirit, that they are not distinct persons, but that the Word signifies the vocal word, and the Holy Spirit the motion created in things." It must always, in due time, oppose the Sabellianism which "designates Father, Son and Spirit, God, but takes Father, Son and Spirit to be only three different modes of the manifestation of the divine essence, so far as it shines into the world, and not inner eternal distinctions in God himself." And it so recognizes the necessary idea that the atoner for sin, and the

sanctifier from sin, must be divine in the strict sense, that after all the objections of the mere logical understanding, it will always, in the end, reject all Arianism—all those views of God which deny the proper deity of the Son and the Holy Spirit. While, on the one hand, it unites with the Church universal in denying "that there are three Gods," it agrees also with it, on the other, in declaring "that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God," denying "all subordination in nature of the Son and the Spirit;" and affirming that "in this trinity there is nothing prior or posterior, nothing greater or less, but that all these persons are co-equal and co-eternal," and that "both unity in trinity and trinity in unity are to be adored."

So justification through faith leads the Christian mind to a ready acceptance of the doctrine of the Church respecting the distinction and the union of the divine nature and the human nature in the person of Christ. It demands a perfect Mediator and a perfect Saviour, a perfect atonement and a perfect redemption. And hence rejecting, on the one hand, the Nestorianism which denies the real union of the two natures in his person, and, on the other, the Monophysitism which denies the distinction of these natures in him, it agrees with the Creed: "That the Word, that is, the Son of God, assumed human nature, in the womb of the blessed virgin Mary, so that there are two natures, human and divine, inseparably united in unity of person, one Christ, true God and man, who was born of the virgin Mary, who truly suffered, was crucified, died, and was buried, that he might reconcile the Father to us, and be a sacrifice not only for original sin, but also for all actual sins of men. The same descended into hell, and truly rose again the third day; then ascended to heaven, that he might sit at the right hand of the Father, might reign for ever over all creatures, and might sanctify those who believe in him, by sending into their hearts the Holy Spirit, who may govern, console, quicken, and defend them against the devil and the power of sin."

And so also, as true Christian experience involves the idea of an immediate connection between the atonement and the forgiveness of sin, it repudiates all Socinianism and all Pelagianism. Looking to him "Who through the eternal Spirit offered himself

without spot to God," and "purged our sins," it necessarily rejects all Socinianism—all views inconsistent with faith in the vicarious satisfaction made by Christ. And saving faith is so deep an experience of our entire dependence on God for all good, of the fact that we cannot produce, and must be only recipients of a righteousness realized in the divine existence from eternity—is so deep a sense of our helplessness in our sins and of our dependence on "the blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" as the only purifier "from all sin;" that it decidedly rejects all Pelagianism—all those notions of the human powers which regard man as taking the initiative in the regeneration and sanctification of the soul, and heartily accepts the declaration of the creed: "That men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, or merits, or works; but that they are justified gratuitously for Christ's sake, through faith; when they believe, that they are received into favor, and that their sins are remitted for the sake of Christ who made satisfaction for our transgressions by his death. This faith God imputes for righteousness before him. (Rom. 3 and 4)." The assurance of salvation involved in justification through faith, the blessed experience of peace and joy and hope; the realization of the union of the ethically necessary and the ethically free, of law and gospel, of the bond of holiness and "the liberty of the sons of God," of fear and love, of profound reverence and filial communion, all these elements of the spiritual union of the soul with God are connected inseparably with the idea of the redemption of the sinful world through the incarnation and sacrifice of the Son of God. The conception of the absolute necessity and the absolute sufficiency of this substitution in our behalf—of this union of creator and creature, of God and man, of the God-man and of the work consummated in and through him, is the sure result sooner or later of the experience of saving faith. In this union of divinity and humanity in the person of Jesus Christ is manifested the fountain of that power of redemption which alone can restore from sin to holiness the sinful creature, and complete its life in God. Union by faith in him makes men partakers of the good, of all good, created and uncreated, primitive and final. Men have in him the union of the ideal and the real, the revela-

tion of an absolutely perfect salvation, bringing the object and the subject into spiritual unity in the Christian consciousness, manifesting pardoning mercy on the part of God, and penitent gratitude and filial love on the part of man. The believer feels that God is "in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them," and that they are reconciled to God through faith in all his claims upon them, because of the union of their nature with the divine in the person of the reconciler. He feels that in Christ God himself has made atonement for sin; that Christ "is made of God" to us "wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption:" that he is our all-sufficient Saviour; that we are a purchased people, "bought not with corruptible things as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of the Son of God, as of a lamb without spot and without blemish." He thus has the conception that Christians are "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ;" that they are known and loved, apprehended and chosen of God in Christ, "according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will." And he apprehends Christians as those who know and love, apprehend and choose God in Christ, and who devote themselves to "the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved."

What has taken place objectively in the incarnation by the hand of creation, is realized subjectively in the Christian spirit by the power of God through faith, namely union with God, not a natural but a spiritual union; a real though gracious union; not a merely moral union but an actual union—which has been aptly designated by Christian thought—the *mystical union* of the believer's soul with God. This is a mystery, the reality of which the inspired mind of Paul recognizes: "When he prays that Christ may dwell in our hearts by faith," and so the Saviour himself when he prays "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee; I in them and they in

me, that they be made perfect in one." For the certainty of this, Christians have the testimony of the divine word; and of its blessed results they have conscious experience. "In whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." Believers have thus a new consciousness of themselves through their faith, that of God's having them in his conscious thought and love, and that of their having existed in the knowledge and purpose of God in Christ from eternity, as well of their having been called and chosen, reconciled and regenerated, redeemed and saved by him through Christ in time. From the ethico-religious process in saving faith, their renewal to holiness, the filial relation to God in which they are placed, believers have not only the Christian idea of God as Creator, of the *distinction* between the Creator and the creature—that new world-view which distinguishes it from the heathen idea of God and the world—but they have also the Christian conception of the *union* of God and man. They "see light in God's light." They know that united to Christ through faith, they are in "the way, the truth and the life;" that they are brought to "the life which is the light of men;" that they have come to the very centre of all truth and reality. Knowing that "he is in them," and "they in him;" that he, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, abides in them, they recognize in the triune existence of God not only the possibility, but the actuality of that self-maintenance and self-communication of God, that union of divine holiness and love which is revealed in the plan of salvation. In the person of Christ, the God-man, they recognize the foundation of the practicability of that union of divine justice and mercy, which through faith is manifested in "the peace of God which passeth all understanding." "Being justified through faith in Christ, they have peace with God, by whom also they have access unto that grace wherein they stand," unto that fountain of the fulness of God which so corresponds to their state of emptiness, unto that divine mercy which is so suited to human sinfulness, unto that divine blessedness which so correlates with the want and misery of fallen creatures; that they

not only in their hearts "rejoice in hope of the glory of God," but have through their intellects a conception of the practicability of their eternal blessedness in an immortal life of perfect holiness and love. They are brought to that "eternal life" which is "to know God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent." In the fact of justification through faith, in the experience of believers produced by the Gospel, there is always present implicitly, in germ at least, that high idea which has come to explicit expression in the creeds of the Church. This revelation of the union of God and man in Christ, this new light coming from God leads to him, confirming, on the one hand, the distinction of God from the world, and exhibiting, on the other, his actual immanence, especially in the moral creature, in the soul which receives in faith this manifestation of the good, as an actual fact, realized in absolute form in the incarnation, in the God-man. Christ is not merely the redeemer of man from sin, not merely the restorer of the fallen to primitive favor, but also the completer of the created nature itself. In the person of Christ, of "the Son who is in the bosom of the Father," is the revelation of the very essence of God. While "no man hath at any time seen God," the incarnate Son of God through his very existence in the world "hath revealed him."

Hence justification through faith alone leads, at once, to that idea of the Church given in the Creed: "That it is properly a congregation of saints and true believers," and to that of the confession of Christ before Pontius Pilate, "that his kingdom is not of this world." "The Church is the body of Christ." Being itself a body, it cannot have a body. It is the spiritual body of Christ, consisting of all those souls who are united to him by the Holy Spirit through faith, and in whom he dwells as his spiritual body. He is "the head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Christians are to hold to "the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." It is not increased by temporal wisdom and power; it "increaseth with the *increase of God.*" It is the dwelling place of God. "In whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord; in

whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God *through the Spirit.*" "We do not *see;* we *believe* in the Holy Christian Church," says Luther. It is no one external organization, no one visible body of men; but an invisible spiritual body, produced and sustained, not by visible power, but by the invisible divine energy of the Holy Spirit. It "increaseth with the *increase of God.*" It makes its invisible presence known in all external organizations, and visible assemblies of men which maintain the preaching of the Gospel, the administration of the sacraments, and the exercise of Christian discipline according to the command and institution of Christ.

The visible manifestation of the Church and kingdom of God will indeed be made; but only at the second coming of Christ, either in the glory of his visible kingdom on earth, or immediately in the glory of his eternal kingdom in heaven. So saving faith joins with the Creed in saying "that the same Christ will return again, openly, that he may judge the living and the dead, etc., according to the Apostles' Creed." The salvation which was purchased by the incarnate Son of God while visible on earth, is now invisibly appropriated to us through faith by the Holy Spirit; but it will also through the blessed resurrection of the body and the final judgment of the soul, be visibly manifested. The incarnate Son of God will be finisher as well as author of eternal salvation. "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself, and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man. The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son." Faith in him, consequently, "reckons that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be *revealed* in us." "He that spared not his own Son but delivered him up for us all, how much more shall he not with him freely *give us all things.*" The union of the divine and human natures in Christ is a reality of universal bearing and eternal significance. It is a world-interest; and it will finally be manifest as the central relation of God to the world, and the central point of the universe of being. In Christ heaven and earth, as well as God and man are united. The chasm between Creator and creature is

closed, through the same mediation by which the breach between the holy God and the sinful world is healed. The incarnation is not a mere divine manifestation which has nothing to do with his inner essence, but it is the revelation of God in one of his persons, in one of the essential and eternal modes of the divine existence and life. And in Christ there is not a mere transitory manifestation of God, or a mere temporary divine act, but the beginning of a new world of humanity, and of a new but immortal life for man. In him humanity is not only freed from sin, but it is brought to the enjoyment of its own true life, and to the attainment of its proper destination, as having been originally designed for union and communion with the divine life and spirit, for the possession and enjoyment of God, the *supreme good and "the everlasting portion of the soul."* It is the highest and the most perduring divine self-communication; it is the personal divine love incarnate; it is the being of God in the world, the life of God with his creatures, changing them from being mere creatures of his creative hand into children of his paternal love. In the consummation of this life in the resurrection of the body, the whole universe will be benefited. "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they but we ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." Saving faith is so wide in its intellectual bearings that it will always, in the end, comprehend the entire Christian idea within the limits of its theology. And however widely it may wander in its thought, and whatever difficulty it may have with the forms in which ecclesiastical orthodoxy has exhibited the Christian idea, it will ever return to the substance of the great symbols of the Church with the feeling that there is even more dif-

ficulty and much less sure footing for it in any other system, and that it may hold to the substance of the great creeds with something of the same *certainty which it has in the divine assurance of salvation itself.*

---

## ARTICLE IV.

### LUTHER AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

By Abraham L. Guss, A. M., Washington, D. C.

"LUTHER INVOKED THE CIVIL SWORD AGAINST THE ANABAPTISTS."

This quotation is found in an address of Dr. Charles J. Stillé before the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and published in their *Magazine*, Vol. IX., p. 370, and also in pamphlet form. The author says that "in those days no one believed in the principle of religious toleration, still less had any one a conception of religious liberty." He then arraigns the great men and the churches for distinct acts of intolerance, in which, as above given, Luther comes in for his share.

I have read this article on "Religious Tests" with great pleasure, but the above quotation with great surprise. It conveys the idea that the Anabaptists were simply a religious society, and that Luther invoked the sword upon them because of their peculiar religious belief, and for the purpose of preventing them from re-baptizing and performing the ceremony by immersion. Nothing could be further from the truth. Re-baptism was a mere incident or side-issue in the doctrines advocated by Thomas Munzer and "the prophets of Zwickau." The statement is not only grossly unfair, but as it stands it is absolutely false.

As a religious sect, their doctrines are condemned repeatedly in the Augsburg Confession, and the re-baptism is by no means the only or most objectionable tenet there pointed out. One of these was the abandonment of civil duties. But in no way and for none of these errors, was it then, or before this, proposed by Luther or his friends to interfere with them by the civil sword. They arose about 1521, and in 1525 were thoroughly under the leadership of Munzer and the prophets. They were

fanatics, who believed in an "inward light," direct revelations, dreams and visions, and an incomprehensible mysticism. Infant baptism was rejected, and even the Scriptures lightly esteemed or discarded, because they could not impart the "Spirit" or divine impulse by which they were to be guided. They opposed Luther because his work was a "servile, literal and half-way" measure. They advocated a total reformation of church and state, a community of goods, the plundering of the houses of the wealthy by the populace, a revolution in which magistrates were to be dispensed with, priests and sinners were to be slain, and the saints set up a kingdom according to their "inward light."

At that period the common people were groaning under the oppressions of their rulers as then vitalized by the feudal system. They had Luther's hearty sympathy, and he wished them success in any lawful measures for redress. Unfortunately the peasants fell into the hands of the communistic fanatics, who used them in their mad attempt to propagate their dreams and schemes by force of arms. As long as these fanatics confined themselves to talking and pamphlets, Luther was opposed to the civil authority interfering with them, for he advocated the broadest liberty, especially in every thing that had the least claim to be classified under the name of religion. He told the princes to let them talk, but to say to them: "Keep the fist quiet for that is our office." Luther published his views in this crisis, warning both rulers and people, in which Dr. Stillé will look in vain for any religious intolerance. There is no proposal to interfere with any man's conscience in religion, unless it was badly diseased.

When, however, they made a formidable insurrection, and incited the peasants with the wildest inflammatory speeches, and were by force of arms trying to destroy all laws human and divine, and introduce anarchy on the chimerical pretext that Christ himself was about to take all government into his hands; then Luther did advocate their forcible suppression, not because they were Anabaptists, re-baptizers, for they were composed of a heterogeneous conglomeration of Catholics as well as Anabaptists and men of no religion at all. They were led by a set of

senseless, visionary, deluded communists and rebels, who were bent on upsetting human society, civil government, and revealed religion. It would be folly to say that the suppression of these visionary madmen was an effort to prevent re-baptism. No one had proposed any forcible interference with their notions on baptism. Outside of their "divine visions," they became formidable because the masses were then restless under the enslavement of the old feudal system, and not because there was a lack of water allowed for any number of immersions.

It would be very unfair to charge that staunch friend of human freedom, Benjamin Franklin, with persecuting the Quakers as a religious society, simply because he helped by "Plain Truth" to break down their peace policy in the administration of the government of the Province; or that he persecuted the Presbyterians as a sect when he wrote his pamphlet against the "Paxtang Boys" for the massacre of the Conestoga Indians. It would be very unfair in any future historian to record that Senator Edmunds invoked the strong arm of the civil authority backed up by the military, to destroy the "religion" of the Mormons.

We can not allow social and civil crimes to shield themselves under the cloak of religion and liberty. The deadly nature of arsenic is not changed even should a distempered druggist label the package as "sugar." Every age has had its "false prophets," but no sane man will advocate their right, under the plea of religion and conscience, to destroy domestic and civil society, to plunder, murder and to destroy all government. If the work of these "prophets" is to be allowed under the head of religious toleration, then human sacrifices may also be practiced under the plea of conscience or pretended divine inward light. There is a broad, plain line between what the civil authorities forbid, and the rights of liberty of conscience and religion. Liberty is not licentiousness—conscience is not a perverted impulse—religion is not a visionary turning of the world upside down.

And yet a very recent Roman Catholic writer (William Stang of Providence, R. I.) charges that all this confusion and anarchy, following in the wake of these visionary prophets, were "the natural consequence of Luther's doctrine on private judgment;"

although he admits that Luther exhorted the peasants not to use the name of Christianity as "a cover for their impatient, unpeaceable, unchristian conduct." Private judgment has always been the great impediment to the spread of Romanism. Erasmus in his chagrin also made the silly charge that by preaching against the bishops and monks Luther had given "occasion to these tumults." This is the shallowest kind of sophistry. The right of private judgment and preaching against the preposterous claims of prelates, must be surrendered to prevent possible contingent evils. It is "let me alone in my evil, or you will be responsible for all the damage I can do in the desperation of death." It is the devil's own request in every uprooted evil through all time. Luther was no more responsible for the fanaticism of Munzer and the Zwickau prophets, (perhaps improperly dignified, under the name of Anabaptists), than the treason of Benedict Arnold was "the natural consequence" of the teachings of George Washington or the Declaration of Independence.

Dr. Stillé thinks that the crowning glory of William Penn's career was his advocacy of liberty of conscience; but complains that in the midst of this noble work he was denounced as a Papist and a Jesuit. It is hard, but it is not uncommon for a man to be denounced for the very noblest and grandest work of his life. It is just what we complain of in the Doctor's article. We are surprised that while Luther at that period was charged with having been the instigator of the peasant's war by means of his religious teachings, that now in these latter days the Doctor represents him as the persecutor of the insurgents whom he sets forth seemingly as only a religious society, persecuted because they were opposed to infant baptism. For, to use the language of a writer in Chambers' Encyclopædia: "At no period of his life is he (Luther), greater than now in the stand which he made against lawlessness on the one hand and tyranny on the other. He vindicated his claim to be a Reformer in the highest sense by the wise and manly part he acted in this great crisis in the history of Germany."

If the Doctor supposes that Penn was the discoverer of "the great principle of liberty of conscience," he is very much mistaken. Luther taught the same principle long before. He was

the great emancipator of human thought. His teachings disenthralled man's intellect, and made it possible for the world to produce such a man as William Penn. That we are not peculiar in our views, and that the charge against Luther is untenable, we quote a few opinions:

The "Cyclopædia of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge" says: "Luther contended for the right of every man to consult the great Book of the Christian Law. The principles of free inquiry, which he introduced led to further results, and gradually established that liberty of conscience, which now exists in all the Protestant States of Europe."

Bancroft, in his History of the United States, observes: "Luther was more dogmatical than his opponents: though the deep philosophy with which his mind was imbued, repelled the use of violence to effect conversion in religion. He was wont to protest against propagating reform by persecution and massacres; and with wise moderation, an admirable knowledge of human nature, a familiar and almost ludicrous quaintness of expression, he would deduce from his great principle of justification by faith alone, the sublime doctrine of freedom of conscience." And again, he says: "Luther alone has the glory of 'forbidding to fight for the Gospel with violence and death.'"

Benjamin Franklin observed that we were "a nation born to liberty," that "liberty thrives best in the woods. America best cultivates what Germany brought forth." It is a matter of no little surprise and pleasure to see that this great philosopher and student of history and human nature, at that early period (1757) already observed that the teachings of Luther had in this country only for the first time found a congenial climate and life-giving soil for their full development. At that date he only saw the vigorous growth, and snuffed the sweet perfume of its blossoms, but the good old hero lived to see its fruitage in all its ripeness, fulness, blessings and glory. Penn, independence, and Franklin himself, and that enlightened public mind that gave, and could afford to give, religious freedom, were the outgrowth and development of Luther's work, and no one observed the causes of these effects more clearly, nor drew the proper philosophical conclusions more correctly than he whom this great

advancement enabled to draw another kind of lighting from the heavens. Both the religious and material world have been reformed by these lightnings which these men drew from heaven.

Pages might be filled with quotations from Luther himself disproving the charge of intolerance. He said: "I could not wish any to contend for the Gospel by violence and slaughter." Again: "I will preach, I will talk in private, I will write; but I will force, I will coerce no man; for I will have the faith accepted without constraint and without force." Again: "It is not right, and I am truly sorry that these miserable people are murdered, burnt and executed. Every one should be left to believe what he will. How easy it is to err! Let us war against them with the Scriptures, but not with fire."

The Romanists then, and since, charged Luther with cowardice and a lack of manly courage, because he would not follow the fanatics into the revolt. This they wished he would do in order that he and his work might be destroyed; but in drawing the line between moral suasion and armed force, he proved his sound judgment and established his greatness. Had he resorted to arms, it would have been as in many former cases, a suppression of the revolt, leaving no moral results; Luther would have shared the fate of Munzer, and left the world none the better for his life.

### TEST OATHS AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

There is another thought connected with the question of intolerance in religion, which while we have our hand in, it is proper should be also stated.

There is in this age a great deal of cheap arraignment of governments and men in former times for requiring test oaths, which are now produced as evidence of bigotry, intolerance, and interference with men's consciences in matters of religion. Dr. Stillé furnishes a case in point. He makes a lengthy statement of the test oath as to Roman Catholics, required in this Province from 1693 down to the time of the Revolution, enforced by the home (British) government, in spite of the provisions of Penn's charter concerning liberty of conscience. Because this test oath was required of all officials, he infers "that serious misconceptions widely prevail in regard to our fathers' relations to the general

subject of religious toleration." The point we make is that this test is not an evidence against the fathers. They were at the time only prudent and proper measures to preserve and pacify the English nation and her dependent colonies.

With governments, as with individuals, self-preservation is a first law of their nature. When certain things are indeed dangerous and threatening, it is proper and wise to provide against them. If at other periods the same causes have become weak and inoperative, it would be useless and folly to send out an army. During the rebellion men were arrested and imprisoned for using certain expressions, because they were then dangerous and calculated to make disturbance. Now those expressions may be repeated even in Congress with impunity, and are laughed at as idle, empty vaporing, furnishing amusing vent holes for surplus bile. We may smile at the fears of our fathers, as illustrated in the test oath; but it was not a mere narrow-minded superstition. The dangers from the French to the English colonies, from the days of Penn's charter to the peace of Paris in 1763, in which France gave up all claims to her provinces adjoining upon us, was a real and formidable danger. And it is a fact, that here, as elsewhere, this danger consisted more in the fact that these men were Roman Catholics and Jesuits, than in their being Frenchmen. The danger was not because these French had their own peculiar religion so-called, but because in addition to the legitimate sphere of religion they were a political oath-bound organization acknowledging allegiance to a foreign potentate above even the King of France. It was not the Catholic Church, but the Roman Catholic hierarchy that they feared. It was the secret, oath-bound propaganda, whose very name has become synonymous with intrigue, with their deceitful, hypocritical tenets that they wished to exclude from places of trust and power. And at the time, and under the circumstances, they were doing right.

We can not admit all sorts of craft to sail under the banners of religion. The case is the same as that of which we have already spoken. We can not permit polygamy and communism and the very destruction of civil government to be carried on in the name of religious liberty, or prevent a fastidious future

historian from denouncing us for interfering with freedom of conscience. There never was an evil that did not seek refuge in some such garb. The real object and motive are so often mixed up in the false pretense—the civil crime so often clothes itself in the garb of conscience and religion that it is no easy matter sometimes to assort them and assign proper judgment. Many of the deluded peasants, under Munzer and others, who pretended to miracles and divine revelations, were fighting for liberty and a redress of grievances as truly as did those at Bunker Hill; and had they been led by Washingtons, we could heartily have wished them a Yorktown.

In the case before us, it is not difficult to assort the Jesuit propagandist out of the Frenchman, or Englishman, or plain Christian. Dr. Stillé is too intelligent a man to need to be told what were the teachings of the Roman See during this period, and what were the obligations of the Jesuits to carry out their mission. He knows that it held that the Pope "has power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths and governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and that they may be safely destroyed;" that "the Pope can depose emperors and kings—he may lawfully absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance;" that every Jesuit was sworn to "do his utmost to extirpate heretical Protestant doctrines, and to destroy all their pretended powers regal or otherwise;" that he was instructed to form cunning political schemes whereby princes may be pushed on to embroil themselves in vigorous war with one another, so as to weaken each other; and a thousand other things of the same character. We deny that the claims of Rome to temporal jurisdiction over any civil government are any part of religion. The pretence is not spiritual or Christ-like, and has no rights of protection against the law. We deny that the great part of the work assigned to the Jesuits comes under the head of religion or spiritual worship, or that laws or oaths in regard to such tenets and intrigues in time of public danger can be branded as interfering with the rights of conscience in religion. The things complained of in the test oath related not to the religious but to the political teachings of these

Jesuits, who not only controlled Canada, but were among the Six Nations and other tribes in alliance with the English, trying to array them against the colonists. These teachings and facts were then notorious, and can not be denied by any candid historian at this day. The form of the oath and its amplification as to the sacraments and the mental reservation and papal absolution, was the accumulation of experience. It was intended to catch if possible those Jesuits who by their oath had agreed "to assume any heretical religion" in order to obtain places in which they could carry out their designs, by means of which, in England, they had more than once laid hands on the throne itself. In order that we may see this, here are the provisions of the test oath complained of as relating to Catholics:

"And we do solemnly promise and declare that we from our hearts abhor, detest, and renounce as impious and heretical that damnable doctrine and position that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope or any other authority of the See of Rome may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other person whatsoever. And we do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath or ought to have any power, jurisdiction, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual, within the realm of England, or the dominions thereunto belonging.

"And we and each of us do solemnly and sincerely profess and testify that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is no transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever, and that the invocation and adorations of the Virgin Mary or any other saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous.

"And we and each of us for himself do solemnly profess, testify and declare that we do make this declaration in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read to us, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted for this purpose by the Pope or any other authority whatsoever; and without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that we are or can be acquitted before God or man or absolved from this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope should dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning."

There is nothing here that was not called into exercise by the peculiar political teachings of the Roman Catholic hierarchy

and her Jesuit emissaries in their efforts to destroy the Protestant governments of England and her Colonies. They were thought to be dangers to thwart which such tests were necessary. Our fathers believed this, and they were correct, and they acted prudently.

Does the Catholic Church now teach differently? Are there now no Jesuits? Then why do we not have the same fears and continue the same precautions? Certainly that Church has not renounced her political claims, for she is infallible! Her teachings are ever the same. Circumstances over which she no longer has control, however, are now vastly different. The world has moved. The masses have become educated. The intrigues of the Jesuits are impotent in the light of the 19th century. Even Catholics themselves in Italy have taken charge of the "States of the Church" and shut up the Pope in the Vatican where he whines as a pretended prisoner. There is no lack of will, but there is a great lack of ability. We can now well afford to smile at the pretensions and claims and instructions, for we know the old man is "sick." We admit that there are still many adherents of Rome even in this country; but they are generally better than their creed. They do not believe in "the temporal power," they have little of the spirit that made the fathers exlude the Jesuits. Sometimes, indeed, there are even yet loud pretenses, and savage denunciations of our common schools; but the bulls are feeble and the world which has out-grown their power laughs at the impotent rage. The age is too enlightened for those operations in which the end was to justify the means. The infallible and unchangeable, which forbid private interpretation in Scripture, has been forced by the march of human progress to change and relinquish her pretensions and to allow men to search the Scriptures without the fear of the rack or the stake.

The war is about over, it is not necessary to keep out the pickets especially during inclement weather. It does not follow however, that we are to sit mute, and hear Washington charged with cruelty in hanging Major André; or Luther, with persecuting a sect because of their peculiar religion; or the fathers of Pennsylvania, with interfering with rights or conscience.

They no doubt had their short-comings, but persecution on account of religion was not one of them. They tried to know the difference, however, between a criminal and a worshiper no matter how clothed.

Turn back, and read again the several clauses in the test oath, and meditate a moment on the depravity in morals, the debauchery of conscience, and the licensed intrigue introduced into society by the Romish Church, which made the precautionary measures in the test oath necessary. There is not an offense in the catalogue of civil crimes but seems to have been authorized by Rome in her grasping after political power. And all this in the name and under the cloak of the religion of Him who said: "My kingdom is not of this world." May we not heartily thank God that our lives were not included in those ages? Let us not then condemn the fathers because in the hour of danger they discerned the distinction between Romanism and Christianity, and yet with great care interfered with no man's conscience in matters purely religious.

We deny, therefore, that prior to William Penn no one believed in the principle of religious toleration or had a conception of religious liberty. We deny that Luther ever invoked the civil sword against the Anabaptists or any other people on account of their religion, and assert that the charge is directly contrary to facts. We deny that on account of the test oaths serious misconceptions can or should exist as to the temper of the fathers in Pennsylvania on the general subject of religious toleration.

# ARTICLE V.

## MINISTERIAL SUPPORT.

By Rev. E. D. Weigle, A. M., Littlestown, Pa.

The topic at the head of this paper has received unusual attention during the last few years. The religious press has spoken its mind through its correspondents, as also through its editors. Much has been said on one side and the other, alike by ministers and laymen. Now and then the secular press has given brief editorials on the same subject. It has been called forth and agitated in the discussion of the "burning question" of a threatened famine in the ministry. Inadequate maintenance is usually mentioned as one of the causes why young men shrink from assuming the duties and the responsibilities of the sacred office. Ministers, by virtue of their office, have a right to expect both moral or spiritual and temporal support. The latter, though thought by not a few to lie outside of the domain of the marks of grace, is enforced by reason, the common sense of mankind, and many a precept, illustration, and example of Scripture. Whether we argue from the nature of the case, in the light of a business contract, or on the score of scriptural injunction, the duty of ministerial support appears among the axiomatic truths of moral and Christian obligation. It will not be attempted to show its claims in the light of scriptural injunction. This might easily be done. That the ambassador of Christ, ministering in holy things, has a righteous claim upon those to whom he ministers, for an adequate temporal support, is assumed. Nor will the history of ministerial support be dwelt upon. It would be interesting, if the facts were at hand, to look back to the days of our fathers and forefathers, those days of simple habits, few wants, earnest piety, and ecclesiastical foundation work, and see what advancement there has been made touching the matter in hand. We shall, however, limit ourselves to an examination of our topic as it stands related to the present.

A broad, catholic and intelligent discussion of the question in its temporal aspects is confessedly difficult, and in its treatment a minister may expose himself to the charge of selfish and mercenary motives. It is difficult because it is almost impossible to secure the necessary data from which a correct deduction may be made. The possession of the facts, and a wide range of them, is what is necessary. What the support of the ministry is, not only in one, but in each of the different branches of the Christian Church should be known, to write intelligently and fairly, so that the facts might bear out the arguments adduced, and the conclusions reached might stand the test of criticism. But nothing has been written on the subject save newspaper articles, owing, doubtless, to the modesty of those immediately affected and experimentally qualified, who would, in the nature of things, be compelled to expose their own deficiencies of support. It is an unexplored field for investigation from which facts might be gleaned which would fill a volume, if some one from the clerical ranks, favored by inheritance or by a pecuniarily fortunate marriage, were disposed to perform this service of love. Of the possible imputation of selfish or mercenary motives the present writer shall take no account, for he is convinced that a candid exhibition of the facts and reasons of the shortcomings of the Church in this matter will condemn not merely the pew but the pulpit as well.

### WHAT THE MINISTERIAL SUPPORT IS.

In order to find out, as accurately as possible, what the ministerial support in our own Church is, a postal card was addressed to the secretaries of the district synods in connection with the General Synod, containing the following request: "Dear Bro.: Will you please ascertain, at the meeting of your Synod, *first*, the maximum, *second*, the minimum, *third*, the average salary of your ministers, and communicate the same to me at your earliest convenience. By so doing you will greatly oblige, Yours in the interest of the ministry." To this communication responses have been received as exhibited in the following table:

| SYNODS. | SALARIES. | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | MAXIMUM. | MINIMUM. | AVERAGE. |
| West Pa., | $1800 | $500 | $806 29 |
| East Pa., | 2200 | 400 | 908 50 |
| Central Pa., | 1200 | 300 | 659 00 |
| Susquehanna, | 1500 | 440 | 819 05 |
| New York and New Jersey, | 2800 | 400 | 980 00 |
| Franckean, | 1000 | 400 | 708 75 |
| East Ohio, | 1500 | 400 | 661 50 |
| Olive Branch, | 2000 | 240 | 724 12 |
| Iowa, | 1000 | 200 | 490 59 |

In the nine synods, out of twenty-three in connection with the General Synod which have reported, the maximum average salary is $980, being that of the New York and New Jersey Synod, the minimum average salary being that of the Iowa Synod, which is $490.59, and the general average of the nine synods reporting is $750.86. From the facts thus ascertained we may conclude, with more than probable certainty, that the average salary of all the synods of the General Synod would not fall below $700,00. In the calculations made, no account was taken of parsonages nor of pastors serving as supply; a majority of pastorates have the former in which pastors live rent free, and of the latter there are a good many who receive but partial support. If the secretaries of all the synods had favorably considered our communication we might have given accurate data as to the actual support of the ministers of the General Synod. It was our purpose to extend these investigations to the other bodies of our own Church, as also to sister denominations, but thus far we have hit on no plan to get at the facts. The whole matter is as difficult as it is interesting.

An examination of the minutes of the Central Penna. Conference of the M. E. Church for the year 1884–5, whose statistics are admirably arranged, reveals the following figures on ministerial support. The table for Williamsport District shows a maximum salary of $1600, a minimum of $355, and an average of $789, with a deficiency in 39 charges or pastorates of $2101. The Danville District gives a maximum of $1500, a minimum of $300, and an average of $754, showing a deficiency in 42 charges of $2141. The Harrisburg District exhibits a

maximum of $2000, a minimum of $200, and an average of $768, recording a deficiency in 38 pastorates of $1318. The Juniata District has a maximum of $1300, a minimum of $60 (supply), and an average of $700, whose deficiency in 35 pastorates is $2664. The Altoona District gives a maximum of $1500, a minimum of $300, and an average of $825, with a deficiency in 34 pastorates of $2063. This gives to the Central Penna. Conference of the M. E. Church, for the year 1884–5, with its five districts, containing 188 pastorates, whose banner church pays a salary of $2000, a grand total of ministerial support, not including house rent or rental value of parsonage, of $144,560, or an average of $768 for each pastorate belonging to the Conference. Of this sum, however, only $134,812 was actually paid, creating a deficiency of $10,287, in reference to which one of the presiding elders remarks in his report: "Almost all this is retained by charges where stewards have established the rule not to pay their pastor in full, if pure indolence, or petty fault-finding can prevent it; by the practice of these tactics a few charges of the district succeed, greatly to their discredit, and the discomfort of the pastor, and the annoyance of the administration." In view of this deficiency, owing in part to the general financial depression, and severe local disasters in part of the territory, another presiding elder observes: "That some of the brethren and their families know what it is to suffer in the work of the church." With these facts as a basis, a fair approximation of what the ministerial support is in the M. E. Church of the United States may be inferred, as the Central Penna. Conference is well suited for the purpose. The average salary of ministers in the whole church, would not materially differ from the above. Of course, in Conferences which embrace large cities within their bounds, a higher average attains; whereas those in rural districts and newer settlements, with no large cities, would show a lower average. It may, therefore, be safely assumed, that the average salary in the M. E. Church may approximately be placed in round numbers at $700. The parsonages of this church are, for the most part, partly furnished by congregations, compensating, in a measure, for the incon-

veniences occasioned by the frequent removals contemplated by the itinerant system.

It is a source of no little regret to the writer that the facts are not at hand which would enable him to give the ministerial support of the clergy of the Presbyterian, Episcopal and Congregational Churches. From what could be gathered from brief references to the subject in the official organs of these bodies in reports of their ecclesiastical convocations, and from the appeals made on behalf of the superannuated and their families, one is led to infer, that, outside of the larger cities, the clergy among them fare no better in the matter of support than those in our communion; although it sometimes happens that those baptized at our fonts, nurtured in our faith, confirmed at our altars and educated in our institutions go over to these churches with apparently no higher motive than that of seeking more and better bread. It is the general impression that the clergy of the Presbyterian Church, as a class, receive more adequate compensation than those of any other communion, and yet with this numerous and wealthy body of Christians the matter of sustentation, *i. e.* the relief of their aged and disabled ministers, their families and the widows of deceased clergymen, is a vital question, indicating the inadequacy of pastoral support to ensure immunity from want in old age, or relief for the bereaved dependent ones. The writer put himself into communication with an esteemed clergyman of the Presbyterian Church in the hope of securing definite data, but his response was: "I know neither the maximum, minimum, nor the average salary even of the ministers of our own Presbytery. Could I mention any person in our connection who could give you the facts, I should gladly direct you to him, but I cannot even do that. There is a good deal of secrecy through the Presbyterian Church on the subject of individual salaries. The minister who receives much does not care to profess his advantage; the minister who receives little, if it is the fault of his congregation generally tries to hide this fault, if it is for some reason in himself and he is receiving all he deserves, of course he has no motive for divulging the fact." How true this is of other denominations. Very few

parochial tables give the pastor's salary in a separate column, it is usually bound up with the sums expended for local objects. We also addressed a note to the *Independent*, a paper encyclopædic in character, asking for information touching the salaries of clergymen in the Presbyterian, Congregational and Episcopal churches, to which we promptly received the following reply: "Dear Sir, We are sorry to be unable to give you the required information. Individuals in some of the churches have collected such statistics, but we do not know where to direct you for the results."

As far as we have gone in our induction of the limited facts however, we are led to believe that the average support of the ministers of the various denominations in the United States does not differ as much as one might suppose. It may be safely inferred that the average salary in no religious body will exceed $800, or fall below $600.

An objection is sometimes raised against the support of Home Missions, even by pastors, on the ground that our missionaries get more salary and have it paid more promptly than pastors in old and established fields, to which the Board looks for aid. But the facts dissipate this objection. The average salary of our missionaries—about $600 in the General Synod—is not as high as that of the other pastors. Then it is to be remembered that the missionary is at a great disadvantage, compared with the pastor of a self-supporting church. As a rule our missions have no parsonages, rents in most of the western towns and cities are exorbitantly high, the perquisites, in the nature of things, small, and many of our missions being located in cities, the cost of living is correspondingly great. Moreover, it requires the best men of the east to occupy the central and strategic points at the west, and the Board to secure them must give them a reasonable support. Some of our missionaries get fair salaries and live as comfortably as the average regular pastor, but many are compelled to exercise rigid economy, undergo severe self-denial in various ways, especially in the supply of literature, so essential to mental growth, to live on the meagre support they receive from their small flocks, supplemented by the Board's appropriation.

The salaries of our Foreign Missionaries, who have left country, home and kindred, have been kept very near the unit with three ciphers attached, and the General Council at its recent meeting in Philadelphia attempted to grade the salary of this class from $600 to $1100, according to the time and proficiency of service. The principle was adopted, but the specific sum was not fixed. The report of the Council's proceedings states that English Missionary Societies pay their men on an average twice as much as the Lutheran Church, the German societies a little less, and the American societies a little more. The maximum salary, in the treasury and correspondence department of the American Board, to which the benevolent people of the Congregational churches of this country give the splendid sum of over *six hundred thousand dollars annually*, has been *thirty-five hundred dollars*,—a salary that many a business firm would have been glad to increase forty or fifty per cent.

Judging from the few glimpses of ministerial support in lands beyond the sea, given us by newspaper paragraphs, the servants of the church there are not overpaid. In Sweden, where the Lutheran is the State Church, the number of parishes is 1356, served by 2,400 pastors. The salary of a pastor, in addition to the parsonage and probably a little land, is from 2500 to 4500 kronen (a crown, equal to 26 cents) making a salary in our money from $650 to $1180. The bishops draw from 10,000 to 18,000 kronen, or from $2600 to $4680. The difference between the minimum and the maximum salary is less than in America, and the larger salaries of the bishops do not exceed those of not a few of our more prominent ministers. The minimum amount of fixed salary paid by the Bavarian government to the Lutheran pastors is $400. After fifteen year's service the salary is raised $50, and every five years the same sum is added until the maximum amount of $600 is reached. No wonder that so many charges are vacant and that the sons of ministers do not follow the paternal profession.

In approximating the figures of ministerial support, it is to be remembered that there are certain indefinite factors, which cannot be taken into the account with mathematical accuracy. Among these are what are usually termed perquisites, intended

as somewhat of a remuneration for services at a baptism, confirmation, wedding or funeral. It is the custom in some sections of the church to pay for all these services. Where this is the case, a small fixed salary is handsomely supplemented. We have no sympathy whatever with a minister who will preach for "what falls," yet some such fare better financially, than others who get a fixed salary. Then there is the annual, and in some cases, the perennial, donation. In the New York and New Jersey Synod, as also in some other synods, ministers receive a fixed salary together with an annual donation. These sometimes amount to hundreds of dollars in value. In other sections of the church, it has become the habit of the people to remember the parsonage by gifts all the year round. There is thus an unnamed and undetermined supplement to nearly every salary, which is an indefinite but real factor, of which an accurate account cannot be taken, but whose elimination from the sum total would be sorely felt by the pastor. Probable perquisites and indefinite donations, annual or perennial, however, should not be made as an apology for small fixed salaries. We know of a minister in another denomination whose salary, not paid in full, was regarded paid because he had received a donation. Some congregations awaken expectations in a newly-called pastor and cover over their sins of financial delinquency by fair promises of large perquisites and liberal donations, neither of which is ever realized in fact. It is believed that it were far better for pastor and people if the salary were, in all cases, fixed on the basis of the pastor's demands for support, and the congregation's financial ability, and if perquisites and donations were left within the domain of the gratuitous. There is inspiration in a dollar, a few bushels of oats, a load of hay, a cord of wood, etc., when these things come as gifts, and not as an apology for insufficient support. It is the opinion of the writer, however, that the sooner the ministry, as a class, is put on an equality with other persons in the matter of support and favors, the better will it be for their Christian manhood, and the cause they represent. The thought of God's servant going from house to house with an empty bag in his buggy, or when traveling depending upon the railroad company for about 40 per cent. re-

duction in fare, or standing before the merchant's counter, waiting for the clergyman's percentage, is belittling and degrading to a high and holy calling. An independent support should be demanded. In not a few instances the insufficient salary is neither promptly nor cheerfully paid. Provoking and embarrassing delays in the payment of that which is over-due, is one of the most unjust and trying elements in ministerial support. Many a pastor has been censured for dishonesty, has lost his financial reputation in the eyes of his people, and has had his sensitive nature outraged, when it was solely the fault of delinquent deacons that he was unable to keep himself in a proper financial relation with the community. The minister, of all men, should pay cash for what he buys, but this he cannot do, when a delinquent congregation and a council lacking the elements of business principle require their pastor to live on his credit by withholding that which is over due.

### CONTRAST WITH OTHER OCCUPATIONS.

From the data secured and dwelt upon, some contrasts and comparisons may be instituted. Ministerial support viewed in relation to occupations such as that of the laborer, the mechanic, the farmer, and the merchant, should be contrasted; viewed in the light of other professions, that of medicine and that of law and that of the civil service, remembering that the ministry is both a profession and a vocation, should be compared. A minister may be conscious that he is called to something definite and peculiar. This, which may be true of every man, is true of the minister in a special sense. "He goes where the light that is within him says, Go; not where the darkness without him says, Come." His is a profession, but it is more; it is a high and holy calling.

Political economy recognizes a vast difference between skilled and unskilled, educated and uneducated, mental and physical labor. The former has always commanded more renumeration than the latter. Yet how often do we hear men say: "A day laborer does not earn above three hundred dollars a year, and he manages to live and maintain a family; why cannot a minister do the same on six hundred dollars? The fact that a clerk

with a wife and one child lived on three hundred dollars, and reported a balance at the close of the year, was mentioned to the writer, as an argument that ministers should lay by money on six hundred a year. But the cases are in no sense analogous. Without going into details, the laboring man's case, and that of the clerk are different as to position, surroundings, the demands made upon their earnings, the qualifications for their work, and the cost of carrying on their vocations. The minister spent eight or nine of the best years of his life in preparation for his work, and that at a cost of several thousand dollars. With this spring-time of life and this money spent, and what it might have accumulated in a legitimate way, all counting for less than zero in the securing of a temporal competency, the demands of his library consume a large percentage of his support after he is in the ministry. The live minister will require, at least, from thirty to forty dollars worth of current literature annually to keep abreast with the thought of the age, while the day laborer or clerk may or may not pay two dollars for a county paper. The stationery and postage of an active minister cost more than the libraries of most laboring men or clerks—to the latter stationery being often furnished as a gratuity. The increased expenses, incident to his position, and growing out of the numerous calls for benevolence, charity, and the promotion of every worthy cause, to which as a representative man he must respond, dare not be overlooked. A minister must practically keep open house, a sort of free inn, for the convenience of the public. Every unemployed brother of the profession, every book agent, every penniless vagrant, calls upon him for entertainment and charity. He dare not be brusque or unkind; his position in the community and the cause he represents alike forbid it. He must feed the hungry, clothe the naked, assist the needy, and right well do this class, worthy and unworthy, know it. Sometimes selfish and penurious members take advantage of their pastor's open house, and his established reputation for hospitality, and even send from their private doors to his ever open one, those who apply for help or entertainment. Then in the matter of dress, readiness to receive and entertain company, and in scores of other ways, which require no mention, the pastor and his

family are at special expense. In view of these things, to put a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ on an equality with an ordinary laborer or a clerk, much as we honor the men of these occupations, is an insult to his high vocation, a misjudgment of the nature of his profession, and an offense against God; for God instituted, and he replenishes and perpetuates the ministerial office. It is his ordainment that those who preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel.

In contrasting ministerial support with the substantial returns which the soil makes in response to the labors of the husbandman, the writer disclaims any unfavorable bias which might be prejudicial to the latter. If ever the day shall come when, for any reason, the work of the ministry must be abandoned, that day may witness a return to the simple scenes and healthful joys of farm life, amid which the lot of his earlier days was cast. There is something in the hum of field labor, the music of birds, the inspiration of growing vegetation, the health-giving air, and communion with nature, which more than compensates for the weariness occasioned by toil, so that the farmer's lot is sometimes envied, and the truth of the poet's lines:

> "How blest the farmer's simple life,
> How pure the joy it yields,"

is often felt. It must, however, be said that there is no class of persons called upon to support the ministry, who are in greater danger of underestimating its righteous claims than farmers. And this is so in the nature of things. They have no means of knowing, accurately, the cost of living. The farmer raises almost everything he needs, and sells produce for the balance. How different from the minister or any other man who lives on a salary. Everything must be paid for in money. There is not a day that he must not reach into his pocket and draw from his support. On this point we cannot do better than give a quotation from an editorial reply found in *The Interior*, Dec. 27, 1883, a leading Presbyterian journal published in Chicago, in which a layman made some bold assertions to the effect that a minister with a family ought to be able to live on $800 and lay by a handsome sum yearly. Among other things the editor, also

writing from the pew, says, "The simple fact is that *he* (the minister) *can't do it* on any $500 or $800 a year, without the most rigorous economy. I would rather have $400 and be a layman, farmer or mechanic, than have $800 or $1000 and be a preacher so far as living is concerned. We will not allow our preacher's wife to come in to meet us from the wash tub. We would call her untidy, and give her husband notice to get out. We will not permit him to wear farmers' working clothes—we would run him off if he did. We tell him that he will not be allowed to practice the economies which we laymen practice, and yet we demand that he shall live as economically as we do."* "The thing will not work, and there is no use in trying to make it work. A farmer will say, 'Why, I don't spend $300 a year.' No, you don't, in money; but you have what would cost $1200 a year to start with, and then you trade butter and eggs and all sorts of produce to your grocer (or market man). And you wear just such clothes as you please, and it is nobody's business. You have plenty of company, and what do you set before them? Ham, eggs, cream, butter, jellies, fruits, vegetables, poultry, preserves, baked potatoes—Irish and sweet—fried parsnips, cold slaw, dressed in cream, not blue milk, pumpkin pie, baked beans—pile your table full, and stuff the guests with good things till it hurts. Ah, dear old coon, you just pay cash for these things at retail prices, and house rent and you will sing another tune altogether." Only they who keep an accurate account of all expenditures are qualified to judge of the cost of living. A farmer friend, with a large and expensive family, commenced keeping an account of the moneys expended for the necessaries of life, (apart from the many products which he already possessed) together with the sums demanded for clothing, for wear and tear, etc., and he stopped. His words were, "It would be enough to set a man crazy." But the only safe way for a minister is to keep an accurate account, and to cut his coat according to the size of the cloth. The wife of an aged minister once made the remark, "We never went into debt. I would make any

*A minister is in some places not allowed to saw his wood, though his purse and health make it a necessity.

sacrifice as to the supply of the table and the comfort of my person rather than to run the risk of debt on our small salary."

There is another point of contrast between the farmer and a minister. It is not an uncommon remark made respecting the minister that he ought to be able to live on what he gets, as if it were a sin for him to have a few dollars left. And if, through rigid economy, domestic discipline and family privations, he manages to save enough to buy a little bank stock, or put a few hundred dollars at interest, or purchase a little property, there are always those who stand in awe, as if the possession of a few hundred dollars, above his actual living, would disqualify him for his work and impair his title to heaven. Now the question, respecting a minister's support, on the part of the membership, should never be on how much can he live, but on how much can he do effective work? How much does he need to render him comfortable in his calling, with a sufficient surplus to keep from his door the ghost of want, when man is bereft of the joys of labor? A wealthy farmer once remarked to the writer: "Of all men, worn out ministers without money are to be pitied. They become a burden to themselves and to others." A true observation, but the thought came to our mind, does God ordain that his servants, after serving their generation in a work which is the admiration of angels and the salvation of men, shall be thrown on the charities of the world? It is freely admitted that some ministers are poor because of mismanagement, extravagance, and a want of prudent foresight. They live just as some day laborers and farmers, without any reference to the future. Such persons would likely die poor, if they were made governors or presidents. But the point of contrast which we now emphasize between the minister of the Gospel and the farmer, in addition to the fact that there is such a wide difference in the manner and cost of living, is seen in the fact that the farmer, through industry, economy and the blessing of providence, is able to leave his family a competency in the form of an estate. For this the farmer labors. If he does not succeed in accumulating something, year after year, he will not continue the occupation. He shapes his outlay for the family, in the way of im-

provements, in the amount paid to his pastor and to the benevolences of the church, with this end in view. Everybody knows how, as a rule, the farmer succeeds in this. The writer knows men who began life with some in the ministry, who, if called away to-day, would leave to their families a handsome estate, personal and real; whereas the ministers spent their patrimony in securing an education, together with the most fruitful years of life, and to-day if death were to interrupt the earthly activities, all that would be left would be their household goods, a library, very valuable to them, but which put in the market would not bring a tithe of its cost, and perhaps a few hundred dollars at interest,—the saved yearly balance of a most meagre support. Not a few ministers have their lives insured, not from choice, but from necessity, realizing that reason, every instinct of humanity, as well as Scripture, urge them to make some provision for the wife of their bosom and the children of their loins. It is a question whether ministers ought to become involved in the care which the possession of much real estate would bring with it, but we do maintain that their support should be such as to justify the accumulation of enough in money, well-secured, to place those dependent upon them above want.

Sometimes a minister by making a small investment has attained unto a competency, through the appreciation of property. The writer has in mind one who, by purchasing some town lots at a nominal price, and retaining them until the town became a city, has through this stroke of good luck, shall we say, become independent, and yet that honest independency cost him his charge. The first Lutheran minister, of whose sermons the writer has any recollection, married a rich wife, whose money he put to work in a lawful way, which secured him and his a competency, and yet some of the people whom that man served, whose salary barely gave him a living support, persecuted him, and begrudged him what of support he received because he was rich, when it was a fact that not one dollar of that money was accumulated from his inadequate support. There are some wealthy ministers, but in nine cases out of ten, their estate has had its basis in an inheritance from the side of the minister or his companion, or in a fortunate stroke of policy in making a

happy investment; and if secured from the support, always at the expense of family comfort, rigid economy, the mental growth and development of the minister himself. The latter way of securing this world's competency generally impairs a minister's influence, abridges his usefulness, and hinders him from attaining that advanced culture which a more adequate support would justify and encourage.

With business men the contrast reaches its climax. As a rule they are men who handle considerable money, make large investments, and whose outlay is relatively great and constant; they are more liberal than farmers or mechanics, and yet this fact offers no comparison between a minister and a business man.

In making a contrast between them it is not our purpose to draw it specially between the great preachers of our city churches and the leaders in business, the bankers, the merchants, and the brokers of our commercial centres. We think a fair case of contrast could be made out even here. There are ministers in our cities, preaching in churches which cost from $100,000 to $500,000, whose members live within the marble fronts of its principal streets, who receive from $5,000 to $20,000 salary. Even here the contrast does not wane into a comparison. It is maintained that our churches should accord with their surroundings. The sanctuary of God in costliness, in all its apartments, and adornments, should be, at least, as substantial and as beautiful as our homes. Residences of marble demand churches of marble. In the golden days of Israel, the Lord commanded Solomon to build a very costly and fine temple. The prosperity of the nation and the honor of God demanded it. So with respect to the support of a minister. The people who live on 5th avenue, New York, in their palatial residences and worship in the massive buildings of wealth's construction, ought, in the nature of things, to pay thousands for the privileges of the Gospel where those in plainer surroundings pay hundreds. We will go a step further, and say that the minister of the sanctuary where the people are poor, and the church is weak ought to, and if he is a true servant of Christ, will make sacrifices to serve those who out of their poverty give him but a very meagre support.

And just here is where the contrast finds its climax. The

day-laborer, or the farmer even, is not to be compared with the well-to-do business man, into whose coffers there is a constant flow of income. A business man in one of our cities may pay $500 or $1000 to the support of his pastor, but what is that when his pastor's salary is not 10 per cent. of his invested capital, nor 20 per cent. of his yearly income. He pays his pastor $500 a year, whereas his business may bring in $1000 a day. This language may seem extravagant. In the New York *Observer* of Oct. 16, 1884, Irenæus, in one of his letters, discourses at length on what he calls church tramps, persons who go from one church to another in the city without taking a pew anywhere, because this costs nothing. His condemnation of this mean habit is strong. He then institutes a contrast between the cost of the church and the opera, so well patronized in our large cities. He says: "The sums it costs are fabulous. A family of five cannot get good seats at the opera for a single afternoon or evening for less than twenty-five dollars. If they take these seats twice a week—equal to two services on Sunday—they would pay $1300 a year for the enjoyment of artistic music, the least objectionable of all amusements which the gay world runs after. The opera does not present itself the year through, but it usually offers its attractions three or four times a week, and many families manage to spend five hundred dollars, and some as many thousands on it in the course of a year."

We have thus referred to the businesses and pleasures of our cities to show that the salaries of the greatest preachers, though running high into the thousands, are very small indeed as contrasted with the capital invested, the extravagances indulged in, and the moneys expended for the fashions and pleasures of this world. The church and its support in the throbbing centres of business and fashionable life as elsewhere, receives but a very trifling proportion of the moneys handled. New York city, the metropolis of this country, expends for public amusements $7,000,000 yearly. Its police force costs $4,000,000, equal to that of its public schools, whereas ministers' salaries, with the running expenses of the churches, amount to but $3,000,000. As we write these lines the daily papers announce that the Hebrew charity ball netted in one night the snug sum of $20,000

in the city of Philadelphia. The American Base Ball Association paid its president a salary of $1800 for the year 1885, with an additonal sum of $500 for traveling expenses. Whenever we look into the domain of business and pleasure, in our cities, towns, and villages, the expenditures for these mount up to such figures that the climax of contrast between them and those devoted to the support of the ministry is reached. Here the saying, dollars for business and pleasure and pennies for the Lord, holds true.

COMPARED WITH THE PROFESSIONS.

There is a class of men whose salaries or renumeration for services rendered, will admit of comparison, their services coming under the head of educated or mental labor. Those in the legal and medical professions, together with persons filling our civil offices, may be compared with ministers. Teachers, many of whom are clergymen, receive a support about equivalent to what they might command in the active ministry, with the perquisites left out. Our teachers as a class are underpaid, and to the question sometimes asked, why do they not pursue special studies and cultivate authorship, a sufficient answer is, they have neither the time nor the means with which to procure the necessary tools. These two things repress natural endowments, weaken the desire for special mental endeavor, and make the cultivation of extensive authorship in the active ministry and the professorial chair impossible.

In the legal and medical professions there is no dearth, as schools of law and universities of medicine send forth their graduates, not by the score, but by the hundred. Notwithstanding the fact that there has been a falling off in medical graduates within quite recent years, owing to the hard times, city, town and rural district discover no lack of legal counsel, nor want of medical attention. The Philadelphia *Record* of September 25th, 1884, contains a gloomy picture of the condition of the legal profession in that city. A prominent lawyer, commenting on the usual Fall exodus of his profession to more lucrative fields for the want of legal business, says: "There are fully 1500 practicing attorneys in Philadelphia, an increase of six or seven hun-

dred during the last half dozen years. Of this number there are perhaps three hundred who do not make over two hundred dollars per annum. These are mostly young men who live at home with their parents or relatives, and are not compelled to make a living. Then again there are almost five hundred who do not average over ten dollars a week. A lawyer who makes $5000 a year nowadays is considered lucky, but there are not many who possess such a good practice." None of the learned professions attracts so many young men as the law, and in none is the proportion of successful men so small. The basis of the fees being the amount involved in litigation and the ability of the counsel engaged, it is the few who comand large sums. The same crowded condition characterizes the medical profession. It is estimated that there is a physician for every nine hundred of our population. If suffering humanity were prescribed for only according to its absolute needs, one half of those administering medicine would be obliged to seek other employment. Yet, despite the crowded condition of these professions, and the inadequate support accruing to not a few, they have, in a pecuniary point of view, an advantage over the ministerial profession. They regulate their own fees, may go where their services will command larger remuneration, and are able to bring all their financial transactions within the domain of business principles. With the minister of the Gospel it is otherwise. He is the accredited ambassador of Christ; his work is largely spiritual; his claims are looked upon as moral; his support is a matter of conscienc and voluntary offering. He is cautioned in his commission against serving for filthy lucre, and his supporters sometimes press the spiritual side of his calling so far as to look upon his salary as a thing too material to engage their sanctified attention. So that, saying nothing of the consumption of heart power in the care of souls by being in uninterrupted contact with humanity in its sins, its sufferings and its frailties, a minister is placed at a great disadvantage as compared with his legal and medical brethren in the matter of financial support. The citation of individual cases is not conclusive in argument, but notice an instance of four brothers, two of whom chose the clerical profession and two the medical. In natural endowments

there was no perceptible difference; in mental attainments the disparity is great. Those who chose the ministry availed themselves of thorough collegiate and theological training; whereas those selecting the medical profession abridged by two years their collegiate course. The ministers are to-day preaching for salaries amounting to six or seven hundred dollars, while the physicians with their imperfect attainments are enjoying lucrative practices, realizing each $1200 a year, above all expenses. Another minister, receiving a salary of $700, has a deacon, a physician, enjoying his sermons and pastoral attention, who clears aside from expenses, a round thousand a year, administering medicine, not to the souls but to the bodies of his pastor's flock. One advantage a minister has over a lawyer or a physician,—that of immediate support. The lawyer must acquire a constituency, the physician must build up a practice. The minister secures or is, at least, promised his salary the day he begins his labors in any particular field. Admitting this, it is to be remembered, however, that the large majority of ministers are from the poorer classes. It is a fact of Messianic precept, Pauline recognition and continuous history, that it is not only to the poor that the Gospel is preached, but the poor are called, or obey the call, to preach it. One of the chief reasons of an impending famine in the ministry is the prevailing worldliness. The love of money has deadened and hushed the nobler emotions of the soul, and under the inspiration of mammon's madness, young men, in harmony with the force of parental example, often choose the occupations and professions which promise the largest returns in money. One of the leading synods of the General Synod reports twenty-three candidates for the ministry only three of whom are able to support themselves. A number of the synods have rescinded standing resolutions requiring young men to be able to enter the Freshman class before they may become beneficiaries. One of these synods had four or five applicants, through pastors, in less than ten minutes after the abolition of the rule. A writer in the *Observer* answers the question, why our Orphan Homes furnish so few candidates for the ministry, by pointing out the mental chasm between an orphan student and a college Freshman, which cannot be bridged over without

means. Whether a young man should receive beneficiary aid before he is a Freshman, is an open question, but the facts given reveal the truth that now, as always, the ministerial ranks are replenished from the poorer classes. Dr. Wm. Taylor, in presenting the report of the Board of Education before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Cincinnati, in May, 1885, took the position that in view of the dearth of ministers, the fact that the sons of poverty are for the most part called, "He who begins his studies for the ministry is truly in the ministry, and ought to be supported by the church, just as the pastor is, though he be only at the gates." To say nothing of those in course of training. Surely the church should not withhold from those in the work, who have come into the Gospel harness under the discipline of poverty, self-denial and the pressure of moral obligation, a prompt and adequate support.

It was our purpose to institute a comparison between the salaries of our civil officers, county, state and national, and those of ministers, but the length of this article forbids it. A friend in the civil service gave us a list of the salaries of the leading officers, as also of their subordinates, and we were somewhat surprised at the low figures. Apart from the President's, the highest salary does not exceed $10,500, and those of the clerks range from $1800 to $1200, with those of officers not classified, as low as $720. In most cases, retrenchment among the subordinate government employes would mean personal and family embarrassment, official inefficiency and public harm. Bearing in mind the cost of living in the nation's capitol, the steady work required, the uncertainties of one's tenure of office and the nature of the service demanded, the salaries of the subordinate officers and clerks of our government are quite meagre enough. The comparison between the support of these and that of the ministry is less sharp than between it and the professions. And yet there is an element of certainty and promptness in the salaries of civil officers which is wanting in those of the ministry. In many quarters the minister's salary is looked upon, not as a matter of finance but as a charity, claiming attention when everything else touching material well-being has been adjusted. This idea of charity in a matter lying clearly in the realm of

business and finance, has wonderfully degraded the ministerial calling.

ITS INADEQUACY.

In the light of the facts hitherto dwelt upon, and leaving out of view the metropolitan pulpits whose pastors in some cases receive a score of thousands of dollars, there is revealed the indisputable truth that of all men of whatever occupation or profession, ministers are the most inadequately remunerated, when we take into the account the time and cost of preparation, the kind and amount of service demanded, the requirements made of them with respect to their families, the peculiar relations they sustain to their people and to society in general, the needful growth of their libraries, the increased actual and incidental expenses growing out of a faithful prosecution of their high calling, and the not infrequent early disablement resulting from the extraordinary tax and constant drain upon the energies of body and mind and heart. To persons not familiar with the invincible facts, and with no personal experience, this may seem surprising.

When it is averred that ministerial support is inadequate, it is not meant to make the impression that the clergy are on the verge of starvation. There are those who have inherited a competency, so that they cannot take up the pilgrim's song:

> "No foot of land do I possess,
> Nor cottage in this wilderness."

Others, with fair salaries coupled with rigid economy, proper domestic discipline, and the blessing of Providence, have risen above the unpleasant prospect of want, in the years when time's shadows begin to lengthen. Still others, as stated before, are poor because of mismanagement, extravagance, want of foresight, domestic affiliation, or a prodigal, hap-hazard way of living, and are consequently destined to remain poor. But, when Ministerial Support in its inadequacy is emphasized, it is claimed to be unequal to the purpose, insufficient to effect the object, unfair as compared with salaries in other departments of physical and mental labor, disproportionate in the light of the quali-

fications demanded, and the service rendered, not competent as a rule, to admit of provision for the unproductive days of life. The inadequate elements are insufficiency, inequality, an improper disproportion which should not exist—an inadequacy which might and should be remedied.

The provision made by the Church for its superannuated and disabled ministers and their families, in its Pastors' and Sustentation Funds; in ministers' insurance leagues; in a more limited way, by individual Synods; in the appeals through the represented wisdom of the Church in its General Assemblies, and by the secretaries of these charities through the church organs, for larger contributions, is a recognition and a declaration of the inadequacy of ministerial support. If the support were adequate, there would be no need for such provision. Who has ever heard of a legal sustenation fund, of a medical insuarnce league, of a charity organization for disabled farmers, or mechanics, or business men. The truth is, these are able to make a judicious provision against the day when a man is unable to labor. Of all persons the faithful minister should be free from corroding cares and perplexing anxiety, in the evening of life. Nothing save a selfishness which is earth-born, a mammon-greed which is petrifying, and a moral degradation which has paralyzed every nobler impulse of the soul, can deny to him who in the day of his strength always stood like a rock against the wrong and always defended the right, the fullest immunity from the shadow of want. And yet, if he is kept on a mere allowance of everyday life, he has nothing in prospect, materially, but the meagre charities of the Church he served. The Pastors' Fund of the General Synod amounted to about $7,000 during the last biennium, a sum quite inadequate to relieve those who called for aid. The delegate from the General Synod South, in his fraternal greetings at Harrisburg, said among other things "that, outside of Charleston, there is not a minister in the Lutheran Church South, who is not compelled to supplement his salary by teaching or manual labor." As long as this is the case the Church will have a mentally crippled ministry, and many beneficiaries depending on her resources. The State provides for the veteran, why should not the Church

provide for its aged ministers? But it is simply a fact that it does not adequately provide for them. The very people who think they show good sense in going to the aged practitioner in law or medicine will replace their pastor, who counts no more if as many years, by a young man, and when an appeal is made for the sustenation of such shelved clergymen will put into the plate the merest pittance.

The notices of vacant congregations advertising for pastors through the Church papers, with the not infrequent clause, "a man with small family preferred" inserted, are a confession of inadequate support. It is not an unusual thing to cut down the salary when a pastoral change occurs. It is an ugly thing to make the matter of family a factor in calling a minister. It might be an advantage to penurious church members for the pastor to have no family at all. But this would be unprotestant, unscriptural, not in harmony with the divine ordainment, and not in accord with an unmarried Paul's injunction; for a bishop is to be the husband of one wife, ruling well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. It used to be deemed a blessing to have children, but if the Church of Christ makes their possession a bar to the securing of a field of labor, it gives emphasis to an idea only too prevalent—that to get a child from the Lord is incompatible with the highest felicities of the family relation.

It was the purpose of the writer to show the inadequacy of ministerial support further by quotations from Dr. John Hall's strong, manly article in the New York *Observer*, in the early part of 1884; from letters of clergymen to the editor of the same paper, who availed themselves of the special rates of one dollar a year to ministers, and from a sermon by Dr. Talmage on "The Boy Home," in Frank Leslie's Magazine, September, 1885, p. 267, but our paper has already grown beyond a proper length.

It would hardly be proper to conclude without suggesting some *remedies*. 1. The place which finance holds in Christ's kingdom, and the distinction between it and benevolence should be emphasized in our seminaries, synods, pulpits and pastoral relation. We will want to get away from this idea of charity

and benevolence, which has somehow insinuated itself into the matter of ministerial support.

2. More information, through our Church organs and from the pulpit, touching the financial demands of a ministry well qualified and growing intellectually, should be given.

3. A common interest and a righteous protection of sacred advantages should abolish candidating and underbidding. Concerted effort, on the part of ministers, should demand more adequate support. In some quarters a judicious ministerial strike would be justifiable.

It may yet be observed that there is no class of men, whose services, viewed in the light of the preparatory training and constant self-improvement required, the physical and mental wear occasioned, and the incessant drain of every power of one's being, are as little appreciated as those of ministers. The average church member has no sort of conception of the labor involved in the conscientious fulfillment of the ministerial office. Some do make it an easy calling, but lean flocks and a suffering Church bear testimony to ministerial unfaithfulness. With some people egotism may be substituted for modest ability, a certain easy-going sociability for hard work, disjointed talks for thoughtful discourses, but, on the other hand, there never was a call for larger ability, loftier enthusiasm and greater sacrifice in the ministerial calling than to-day, in order to reach the highest usefulness. It is to be remembered, however, that as the work of the ambassador of Christ in nature, in character, in aims and results, bears a relation to both worlds, this and the one to come, the chief remuneration for services rendered is not in dollars and cents and does not come within the domain of temporal things. In its nature so divine, in its character so beneficent, in its aims so benevolent, in its results so far-reaching—showing a redeemed world restored to god-likeness and heavenly fellowship, the reward is not confined to earth. As Moses refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with God's people, then to enjoy the pleasures of sin on Egypt's throne; as the blessed Christ, though being rich, for our sakes became poor, making himself of no reputation, assuming the form of a servant, giving his life a ransom

for man, for a lost world's salvation; as the Apostle Paul, after experiencing the gospel as the power of God, to save the race, suffered the loss of all things, recognizing himself as crucified with Christ, not counting his life dear to him that he might accomplish the ministry which God had entrusted to him, having no purpose or desire of heart, but the salvation of souls; as the lion-hearted Luther quailed not in the presence of the devil, popes and councils but brought forth from under the dust of tradition the pure word God, in the face of anathemas and excommunication, at the risk of life itself, without any hope of temporal reward, near or remote; so the Moses of to-day, the servant of Christ, the successor to Paul, and the son of the Reformation, whilst he can of right claim an adequate temporal support, based on reason, common sense, and Scripture, ceases not his work if there be a lack here, but foregoes the emoluments and comforts of time, and even suffers much in the way of privation, self-denial and persecution, because like Moses he has respect unto the recompense of the reward; because like his Master, he contemplates the joy that is set before him; because like Paul, he counts everything else but dung that he may win Christ and be found in him; because like Luther, under a clear conviction of duty he can say, "Hier stehe ich, ich kann nicht anders." There are times when the faithful minister of Christ, notwithstanding all that has been said, and might yet be said, about the peculiar temporal disadvantages of his calling would not exchange his pulpit for a throne, the domain of his heavenly influence for a kingdom. There has been too much made of the matter of insufficient temporal support, as a reason for the "ministerial famine" now afflicting the Church. The true minister, moved by an overwhelming conviction of duty, will preach the Gospel without any support rather than disobey God and forego the recompense of the reward.

When the faithful servant of Christ shall come bringing his sheaves with him; when the shepherd and his flock shall be permitted to stand on the right hand of the Judge of all the earth and shall hear the welcome, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; when the blessed Saviour, who is now the

judge shall call his servant to share with him his throne because in suffering and overcoming he had on earth followed his Master; when into his labor-worn hands shall be placed palms of victory, upon his earth-weary brow a crown of glory, adorned with many a star; when the title of king and priest unto God forever and ever, and that for which it stands shall be an enduring reality; then the privations, sacrifices self-denials and non-appreciations of earth shall fade into oblivion, even as the mists of morning vanish before an ascending sun.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### THE DIVINE IMAGE LOST AND RESTORED.

By Rev. P. Bergstresser, D. D., Waynesboro', Pa.

A good starting point in the discussion of the Higher Christian Life, is found in contemplating the divine image in which man was originally created. God said: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." Gen. 1 : 26, 27. According to the New Testament the Son of God is the original image of God, and to him men are to be conformed spiritually and physically. Col. 1 : 15; Phil. 3 : 21; John 3 : 2. According to this original image of God man was created. Hence, Adam was "the figure of Him that was to come." Rom. 5 : 14. The original idea involved in the creation of man in the image and likeness of God can therefore be only fully realized through Christ. It is through Christ that man is to attain likeness to God. The divine image according to the Holy Scriptures is therefore partly original *endowment*, and partly *destination*. Man's fellowship with God in Christ is an essential element in the progress and ultimate attainment of man's perfection. He was fashioned after the most excellent pattern. "For thou hast made him but little lower than God." Ps. 8 : 5.

In what therefore did the image and likeness of God, in which man was originally created, consist? It consisted in his *intellectual* and *moral* nature and in his *eternal destiny*. "Know that

the Lord hath set apart him that is godly for himself." Ps. 4 : 3. In Col. 3 : 10, Christians are exhorted to "put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." And in Eph. 4 : 24, thus: "Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." By these passages we see that the image of God consists in intellectual and moral qualities, conforming ultimately to the image of the Son in our glorified state. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." 1 John 3 : 2.

"If the divine Logos had not himself become man, the ideal of humanity would never have been realized; for each of the created individuals represents only an imperfect, a relative union of the Logos and man, of the uncreated and the created divine image. The Logos having become man, reveals the whole fulness of the ideal according to which human nature was originally planned, but which can be realized only imperfectly in each finite individual. If the divine Logos had not become man, humanity would have been without any real point of unity and without a head. It would have wanted the actual Mediator, who alone can lead the species out of the created relations of dependence into the spiritual relations of freedom, who can raise it from the level of natural life to the level of perfection and true being. We therefore accept the essential Christian belief, that the Son of God would have been made man, and would have come into the world, even if sin had not come into the world,—the belief, that when God created man after his own image, he created him in the image of his Son, in the image of the Son who was to become incarnate, so that even at the creation of man the image of Christ was present to the mind of the Creator, and was the prototype according to which man was created." So *Martensen.*

St. James also tells us that "men were made after the similitude of God." Man was originally possessed of *truth* and *righteousness.* But it is not so now with him. He has lost the image of God, and has become the image of the devil. His understanding is now full of falsities, and his heart is full of evils. "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint." How

could sin originate in this divine image? And how can he be restored to his more than original glory?

I. THE DIVINE IMAGE LOST.

We have in the book of Genesis the best account of the process in which man lost the divine image. 'The Old Serpent' said to the woman, "Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" The woman replied, "We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." The devil said to the woman, "Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Gen. 3 : 1–5. "When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened." They gained a a knowledge of the evil by a loss of the good. So it must ever be.

Adam was a free personal agent. The test of his loyalty in the forbidden fruit, involved an appeal to his appetite on the one hand, and on the other to the approbation of his God. The natural and the spiritual came in conflict, and thus gave occasion to alternate action. The constitutional desire to gratify appetite was not sin. It was only in such craving that there could be the trial of obedience. Just at this point man was open to temptation. Extraneous influences might be introduced, to strengthen the desire to gratify, and weaken the power of effectual resistance. The devil saw how man's mind could be made to move in order to effect this end. Reverence for the divine sanction must be removed. That was most artfully done by simply questioning, whether the sanction had been understood. This excited the desire to taste. The bare suggestion of selfishness in the prohibition, prepared the way for the transgression. These evil thoughts, infused into the minds of our progenitors, did not originate in them, but they came

from the tempter. We are not now, however, endeavoring to account for the origin of evil in the universe, or how Satan became a sinner, for we may be destitute of some of the data necessary to form a just conclusion, but only how evil thoughts became sinful actions and sinful dispositions in man. We are assured that evil did not and could not originate in God; and also that man is the author of his own sinful actions and sinful dispositions. There was a time when man was not a sinner; and there was a time when he became a sinner. The sin of our first parents was not yet when the evil thoughts were suggested by Satan, nor when the desire of knowledge was awakened in them, nor when their æsthetic emotion of the beautiful was excited; but sin came in when they believed the father of lies, and when they disobeyed God's word. They did not in their minds and hearts hold fast to what "God said." Man made in the image and after the similitude of God is a moral being; who is "not to live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Deut. 8 : 3 ; Mark 4 : 4. Neither is it necessary in order to constitute a just trial that the moral agent should perfectly understand at the time being all the reasons for the divine prohibition; for the very best reason that can be given is God's word. God is infinite in wisdom and goodness, and all his commands are essential to the moral agent's good. Nothing can take the place of God's word without the destruction of the moral agent. Man lives by God's word, and dies without it. How difficult for sinners to comprehend the value of God's word! "By one man sin entered the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Thus truth was corrupted in man's intellect; holiness, in his will; and blessedness, in his heart. Thus man lost the beautiful image and likeness of God, and became the image and likeness of the devil. Prior to the fall man had truth and holiness; but after the fall he was filled with falsity and evil.

What wonderful changes were induced by sin! It brought man directly under the penalty of eternal death. There could be no alternative unless through a change of dispensations.

Such a change had already been contemplated in the divine counsel. God's highest end in the creation of man, the holiness and happiness of man, seemed to have been frustrated by the fall. But God's end in the creation was as dear to him after the fall as it was before it, therefore a dispensation of grace was introduced. All that we here need to apprehend is that this change of dispensations satisfied justice as well as the infliction of the penalty would have done.

But all sin originates in the same way as it did at the beginning. "Sin is the transgression of the law." Evil thoughts become sinful actions and sinful dispositions through the heart. Sin cannot originate in any other way. "When lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin." That which comes out of a man's heart morally defiles him. The Augsburg Confession teaches that "the cause of sin is man's perverted will." And this "perverted will" is accounted for by the same confession thus: "Since the fall of Adam all men who are naturally engendered, are conceived and born in sin; that is, they all are from their mother's womb full of evil desires and propensities, and can have by nature no true fear of God, no true faith in God; and this innate disease, or original sin, is truly sin, which brings all those under the eternal wrath of God, who are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit." Thus the grace of God, brought to us in the word and sacraments, counteracts the power of natural depravity, and leaves us free to choose the good and avoid the evil. In other words, "the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

The origin of sin is clearly set forth by Christ in his controversy with the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. He said: "That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: all these evil things come from within, and defile the man." Mark 7 : 20–23. When these evil thoughts find their way into the human heart, which is naturally inclined to admit them, and when they are harbored there, they come forth as sinful actions and sinful dispositions. Six of these

classes are in the plural number (see the Greek or Rev. Vers.), and six are in the singular. The plurals, namely, "adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetings, wickednesses," are six generic classes of sinful actions; and the six singulars, namely, "deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness," are six generic classes of sinful dispositions. The generic classes of sinful actions culminate in "wickedness;" and the generic classes of sinful dispositions, culminate in "foolishness." These twelve classes embrace generically all the specific sinful actions and all the specific sinful dispositions that are mentioned in the Scriptures. All these sinful actions and sinful dispositions proceed from the unregenerate heart. Their name is legion; for they are many.

The great changes brought about by the fall of man are to be found therefore in his moral character. His constitutional organization is not changed. Man is now as he was originally composed of the sensuous and the spiritual. The moral character is determined by the preponderance of the one or the other. In the shipwreck of the fall no integral part of humanity, except his fellowship with God, was lost; and a susceptibility for that fellowship is still retained. Man's moral obligations are therefore still the same as they were in Paradise.

But the loss of the image and likeness of God is not simply destitution of truth and righteousness. There are many things destitute of holiness, which cannot be said to be depraved. Man is positively depraved. His mind and heart are directed toward self, and turned away from the Lord. He continues to believe Satan's lies, and to disobey God. The whole inner spiritual life is wrong. He stands condemned at the bar of his own conscience, which shows that the divine presence is not yet entirely withdrawn from him. Thus instead of rest, there is unrest. Instead of his will being in harmony with the divine will, loving what God loves and hating what God hates, he has the divided inclination of the will, which is feebly inclined to what is good, and strongly bent to inferior and selfish ends. His animal nature usurps supremacy over his rational. "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." Rom. 8:7, 8.

But the sinner in his unregenerate state regards sin as a light thing. He regards his sins as a few isolated acts of transgression for which he can very easily excuse himself under the circumstances. He never takes into consideration his sinful state or condition. The light of truth has died out of his mind; he has no true knowledge of God and no spiritual affections. He has no taste for holiness. He thinks he is alive, but he is spiritually dead. You may endeavor to illustrate his horrible state by examples drawn from nature and the Scriptures, but he understands not their personal application. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. 2 : 14.

The overt act of transgression is to natural depravity what the thunderbolt is to electricity. As electricity pervades all nature, so natural depravity pervades our whole spiritual being. When the dark rainclouds overspread the heavens, and when driven by contrary winds they rush in upon one another like contending armies, and when a thunderbolt occasionally falls upon the earth, upon house, or tree, or man, or beast, laying all in irreparable ruin, then is seen the power of that invisible agent, which we call electricity. So also when the motions of sin, yet fiercer than the troubled and warring elements, rush and roar through the inner man, agitating the whole spirit, soul and body, turning his throat into an open sepulchre, and his tongue into the sting of an asp; when the sinner's mouth is filled with cursing and bitterness, and his feet are swift to shed blood, and the gracious light of heaven is shut out of his mind and heart; when sin overthrows empires, and kingdoms, and republics, and sweeps from the face of the earth whole peoples, then too is discovered the nature and power of inbred depravity which lies deep in man's wicked mind and in his foolish heart.

"The sting of death is sin." 1 Cor. 15 : 56. But what mortal comprehends the import of that? Yet the sinner regards sin as a very trivial affair. Would a father consider it a light thing, if he should see his child playing around the cavern or hole of the asp? Would he consider it a trivial matter, if he should learn that the child had been bitten by the deadly ser-

pent? But sin is worse than the sting of the asp. "He that committeth sin is of the devil." 1 John 3 : 8.

But the sinner is unwilling to acknowledge that all his actions and all his dispositions, while he is out of Christ, are sinful. As long as he is out of Christ, as long as he is in his unrenewed state, whatever he thinks, says, or does, all is sinful. Is it asked, "How can these things be?" St. Paul answers, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. 16 : 23. Has an unregenerated man faith? "All men have not faith." 2 Thes. 3 : 2. If a man has no evangelical faith, a faith that enlightens the mind and changes the heart, then all his thoughts, words and actions must take place in unbelief, and therefore all must be sinful. "For as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." Prov. 23 : 7.

To bring the sinner to a consciousness of his sins and his sinful condition, we have the law of God, which is the perfect standard of holiness. "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3 : 20 The law says: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself." Luke 10 : 27. But how is a sinner to attain this perfect standard of holiness? How shall he do this when every thought of his mind and every purpose of his heart is sinful? For all his thoughts and purposes originate in unbelief. If it were not for the law, the sinner could never be truly convinced of his lost and ruined state. "I had not known sin but by the law, for I had not known lust, except the law had said, thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that

sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful." Rom. 7 : 7–13.

There are two things to be observed in this passage of Scripture, as it stands related to our subject. The first is, that it represents sin as a condition or state, in which the awakened sinner finds himself involved, without any hope of recovering himself from it. For sin is not here treated by St. Paul as a mere isolated act of transgression, which indeed follows as the mind, heart, and will of the sinner are exercised by evil. The second is, that the law, which cannot help the sinner, yet demands the removal of this condition or state, in order to the proper exercise of truth and righteousness.

Wherefore then serveth the law? "It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." Gal. 3 : 19. The law may therefore be considered as a mirror, in which the sinner sees his defects and the obliquity of his moral character; or, as a kind of balance in which his actions and dispositions are weighed, and found wanting. Let any one consider its demands, and then let him ask himself, "Am I all that the law requires me to be?" If we are honest with ourselves, we must say, "If I justify myself, mine own mouth shall condemn me: if I say, I am perfect, it shall also prove me perverse." Job 9 : 20.

The state of the unregenerate man is therefore dreadful. He neither knows the horrible state of sin in which he is involved, nor the excellency of the law which he has violated. The more excellent the law, the greater the crime of violating it. But the divine law is holy, just and good, without any defect or imperfection. It shows forth the essential nature and character of God; who is personaly *truth*, *justice* and *goodness*. This is the very divine image which man has lost. The law will not allow a single defect in man. "The law of the Lord is perfect," and demands perfection.

It will not satisfy the law for the sinner to excuse himself on the ground that he became involved in this condition of sin without his consent, having had nothing to do with his birth into the world. The objection does not reach the case under consideration; for it does nothing in the least toward rescuing

man from his lost condition. It just tends to show his utter blindness in that he is content with his hard and impenitent heart. We must learn to view sin as a dreadful reality, in which we find ourselves naturally involved. The law cannot help us out.

If by a single blow the law of gravitation could be perverted, deranging the harmony of the physical universe and causing worlds and systems of worlds to dash together in wild confusion, would not that blow thus given, and thus operating, be a very serious matter? What the principle of gravitation is to the natural world, that the law of God is to the moral world, binding all moral creatures in harmony with one another and all to the throne of God. All the requirements of the law are summed up in one word, and that word is *love*. It is against love that sin wars, and therefore against the well-being and happiness of all the creatures that God has made.

Now, unless sin be removed, man's unhappiness which lies in his separation from God, will for ever continue. "The wages of sin is death." "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." "Indignation and wrath, tribulation, and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil." "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Every sin, according to the Scriptures, deserves the wrath and curse of God, both in this life and in that which is to come; or, in other words, everlasting perdition is the penalty of God's violated law. What an awful penalty!

But some object to the possibility of such a penalty being inflicted on the ground of its severity. It is asked, "shall one sin consign the soul to the penalty of eternal death?" Certainly, from the very nature of sin. The penalty can be diverted only by a restoration of the divine image. "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them." When a man burns down the house of his neighbor, he is arrested and convicted for the crime of arson. But the person convicted for burning down one house, is as certainly exposed to the penalty as if he had burned down

a thousand. If this principle is correct in human law, why not also in the divine? St. James says: "He that offendeth in one point is guilty of all." If one link is broken the whole chain falls to the ground. So with man's chain of righteousness; it has been broken by sin. "There is none righteous, no, not one."

Another objects that "there is no proportion between the time occupied in the commission of sin, and the duration of the punishment." Is there any reference made to the time occupied in the commission of an offence against civil law? When a man draws a pistol on another, and kills him in a second of time, he is arrested and tried for wilful murder. Suppose, however, his lawyer should plead for the acquittal of the murderer on the ground that it took only a second of time to kill him. What judge or jury on that ground would have a right to acquit the man? Human law lays no stress on the time occupied in its violation; the simple question is, touching the fact of the violation. When the fact is established, the law demands that the penalty should follow. If this principle is correct in human law, why is it not also in the divine? The human is based on the divine. If moreover the violation of the human law demands the life of the transgressor, why should not the violation of the divine law, demand the forfeiture of the soul? The image of God is therefore lost by sin. The only possibility of salvation lies in its restoration. Therefore let us consider,

## II. THE DIVINE IMAGE RESTORED.

The restoration is effected "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." "Except a man be born again, he cannot see, nor enter into the kingdom of God." John 3 : 3, 5. "He must be born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit." In this restoration Christ is the essential element, and the Holy Spirit is the grand agent. "No one can say that Jesus Christ is Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." 1 Cor. 12 : 3. The mystery of this restoration is "Christ in us, the hope of glory." Col. 1 : 27. He is the element of this higher Christian life. "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." 1 John 5 : 12. "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ

from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. 8 : 11

The process of the restoration of the divine image is the reversal of its loss. We have seen how it was lost. The unbelief of our first parents came by hearing the *untruth* of the devil. Unbelief could have originated in no other way. The devil presented the *untruth* to the minds of our first parents as superior to divine *truth* or the divine word. That untruth they took into their minds, and their hearts rested in that, and thus they became unbelievers, and fell from God.

The restoration to the divine image is now effected through the *truth*. We have a divine revelation of the truth. It is in the Gospel. "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written. The just shall live by faith." God's word is the truth. "And this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto us." 1 Pet. 1 : 25. Jesus says, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." John 14 : 6.

As original unbelief came by hearing the untruth, so original faith comes by hearing the truth. "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom. 10 : 17. As Satan entered into this divine image through belief of the untruth to destroy it, so Christ enters this lost divine image through belief of the truth to restore it. The divine process is beautifully set forth in the parable of the sower: "But they on the good ground are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience." Luke 8 : 15. Satan's word, received into the heart of man, destroys the man; but Christ's word, received into the heart of man, restores him to truth and righteousness, in which the divine image consists. Thus the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. On the other hand, when any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart, lest he should believe and be saved.

The divine *destination* of man is attained in his final glorifica-

tion. "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Rom. 8 : 29, 30.

The final restoration of the divine image in our glorification, is reached through much conflict with evil. Evil must be conquered through faith. "For whosoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" 1 John 5 : 4, 5. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." 1 Cor. 15 : 26. "Thanks be to God, who giveth us victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

But whence do evil thoughts originate in the renewed mind and heart of the Christian? That all Christians are tempted with evil thoughts is known by universal experience. It was also Christ's experience. "He was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." He was tempted with evil thoughts, suggested by the devil, not only in the beginning of his ministry, but also during his whole earthly life, until he exclaimed on the cross, "It is finished." Then the conflict was over, and the final victory obtained. "Though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him."

The question now resolves itself into this: Does the regenerated Christian sustain the same relation to evil thoughts that Christ and our progenitors before the fall sustained to them? Has not the good man's natural depravity some relation to the origin of his evil thoughts with which he is daily tempted?

It is evident that there are two fundamental and radically different laws or principles in constant conflict in the renewed man. The one is called "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus;" the other, "the law of sin and death," or, "the law of sin in the members." The Christian feels that his growth in holiness is a constant conflict with evil thoughts. In this con-

flict the Christian's will often runs, in its pursuit of holiness, in advance of its ability; in the heart where the work of sanctification is going on, his will often makes great strides in its eagerness to obey the law of holiness perfectly; but when "the law of sin in the members," comes again with its power, the will sinks below its former tension, and does not, while indeed it gains a victory, gain as much of a victory over evil, as there was previous desire. Having passed through the conflict with certain classes of evil thoughts, the Christian realizes by bitter experience that he has been somewhat scratched by sin, like a man having passed through thorns; or, he realizes in the conflict that the foul breath of evil has to some extent dimmed the mirror of his Christian consciousness. But are not these scratched of sin marks of imperfection? Is not this dimness in the mirror of his Christian experience a consciousness of sin? It may therefore be said that a Christian sometimes, in the moments of a blind impulse, does what he would not, and falls below that strict adherence to holiness which he willed, when his will was at its greatest tension. "I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me." In one sense, no person can do what he does not will to do; but at one time he can fall far below in doing what at another time he willed to do. In this case the will must be viewed at two different stages of tension for holiness. But there is a constant advancing to a higher standard. The gracious operation of the Holy Spirit, brings the Christian's will more and more up to a perfect standard of holiness, which is Christ in us, the hope of glory, while "the law of sin in the members," continually depresses it. "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

The Christian always has the divine help to contend against evil thoughts; and he gains more and more power in "the inner man" in this conflict. The grace of God alone can bring us from one step of holiness to another. By Christ we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. The advance is "from faith to faith;" but all in harmony with our free will. Christ dwells more and more richly in our hearts by faith, which is substantially the divine

nature. This divine nature or the Christ-life, thus keeps shifting the standard or holiness or the new obedience higher and higher, as we hunger and thirst after righteousness, with the assurance that we shall be filled in due time with all the fulness of God. The goal is reached through the faith of the operation of God.

Is there a possibility in this life of getting beyond this conflict with evil thoughts? Not from what St. Paul says in Rom. 8 : 10: "And if [although] Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness." Again: "For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith." Gal. 5 : 5.

But if original sin is extirpated in the higher Christian life, as some contend it is, then we as Christians are placed on the same basis with Christ and our progenitors before the fall. There are insuperable difficulties connected with this teaching. If original sin or natural depravity has ever in any case been extirpated before the natural death of the Christian, how does it come that every natural birth needs a spiritual birth? "That which is born of the flesh is flesh."

The true doctrine we hold to be this: that the blood of Christ through faith is a constant propitiation for our sins and imperfections; and that the life of faith in us, which may grow into the full assurance of faith, in its conflict with evil thoughts, whether originated by the direct suggestions of the devil or by our natural depravity, can deliver us entirely from sinful actions and sinful disposition. "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof." In this sense, "We know that whatsoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." No true Christian sins wilfully, habitually, or characteristically.

# ARTICLE VII.

## THE LAW OF CHURCH ELECTIONS*

By Rev. William Hull, Hudson, N. Y.

In the United States, corporations of all kinds are created by authority of the legislature. In the state of New York and in the other states, statutes have been enacted for the incorporation of religious societies in an easy and popular manner, thus saving the delay, trouble and expense of an application to the law-making power in each individual case.

In his work on "Religious Corporations," (pp. 3, 4,) Mr. Snyder says, "During the colonial period there was no general law authorizing the incorporation of religious societies. Special charters under the great seal of the colony of New York were occasionally granted to particular organizations. The growth and development of religion was hindered in consequence of this illiberal policy to the injury of society. Persons were not disposed to endow institutions having no legal existence, and refrained from making substantial contributions for the support of the Gospel, when there was no particular body or individual authorized by law to administer their pious offerings. The spread of immorality consequent upon this state of affairs, is recognized by the legislature in the preamble of the Act of 1693, (Laws, chapter 36) authorizing the assessment of a tax for the support of the ministry. The language is as follows: "Whereas, profaneness and licentiousness have of late overspread this province, for want of a settled ministry throughout the same, to the end that the same be removed and the ordinances of God duly administered: Be it enacted, etc." No general statute was, however, enacted under which a church could be incorporated, until after the colonies had declared their independence. On the 6th of April, 1784, the first general act

*A lecture delivered before the students of Hartwick Seminary by the author, as Lecturer on Ecclesiastical Law in that institution.

was passed which contained provisions similar in nearly all respects to the Act of 1813, now in force. This Act. was retained, with some modifications, in the first revision of the statutes in 1801. (Kent and Radcliff's Laws, Vol. 1, p. 336, chap. 79.) It was re-enacted with some additional provisions on the 5th of April, 1813, and remains in force at the present time."

This Act of 1813, containing sixteen sections, provides for the incorporation of (1) Protestant Episcopal Churches; (2) Protestant Dutch Reformed Churches; (3) Other Churches. The incorporation of Lutheran Churches therefore comes under the last head. Whenever a society exists which has not been incorporated, or when a new organization is effected, the mode of incorporation is as follows: The minister of such church, congregation or society, or in case of his death or absence, or there being no minister, then one of the elders, or deacons, or for want of such officers, then any other person being a member or stated hearer in such church, congregation or society must publicly give notice to the congregation, of the time when, and the place where, the election is to be held, at least fifteen days before the election. This notification must be given for two successive Sabbaths, or days on which such church, congregation or society shall statedly worship, next preceding the day of such election. The notice must state that on the day designated trustees will be elected for the church, congregation or society.

At the time appointed for the election, two of the elders shall preside, and if there be no such officers, then two of the members of such church, congregation or society shall be chosen by a majority of the persons present to preside at such election; receive the votes of the electors; be the judges of the qualifications of such electors, and they shall be the officers to return and report the names of the persons who by a plurality of votes have been elected to serve as trustees for such church, congregation or society.

Immediately after such election the presiding and returning officers must execute an instrument under their hands and seals, certifying the names of the persons elected to serve as trustees

for such church, congregation or society, and the name or title by which such trustees and their successors shall forever thereafter be called and known. The *name* of the church must be determined by the vote of the electors and be particularly described in the certificate. The number of trustees shall not be less than three nor more than nine. The statute says that they are to be discreet persons—they need not be communicant members of the church, and they are to take charge of the estate and property belonging to such church, congregation or society, and they are to transact all the business connected with the temporalities.

In their certificate the persons who presided at the election are to state the notice given, the assembling of the electors, the trustees elected, the name of the corporation, &c. They are to sign and seal the certificate, to acknowledge it before a judge of a court of record, or some other officer authorized to take proof of conveyances of real estate, and then the certificate is to be recorded in the office of the clerk of the county in which such congregation is located, in a book provided for that purpose. The fee prescribed for such recording is seventy-five cents. As soon as the certificate is delivered to the county clerk, the incorporation is complete, and the society becomes a religious corporation and enters upon its corporate existence.

The trustees are to be elected for three years, and immediately after their election they are to meet and to be divided by lot into three classes, to serve one, two and three years, and thus at an annual election each year one third of the trustees will be elected.

The powers of the trustees when thus elected are enumerated in the fourth section of the Act of 1813, and among other things it is said: "The trustees of every church, congregation or society hereinbefore mentioned and their successors shall respectively have and use a common seal, and may renew and alter the same at their pleasure, and are hereby authorized and empowered to take into their possession and custody all the temporalities belonging to such church, congregation or society, whether the same shall consist of real and personal estate, and whether the same shall have been given, granted or devised di-

rectly to such church, congregation or society, or to any person for their use.

They were authorized to hold property, the annual income of of which should not exceed $3,000, but by the laws of 1875 this provision was increased to $12,000.

### I. WHO MAY VOTE FOR TRUSTEES?

1. *At the first election.* The Act of 1813 confined the electors to male persons of full age, but by the laws of 1867 (chapter 656) the word *male* was stricken out, and now all persons of full age are eligible as voters.

In regard to that first election the Act of 1813 (§3) says, "Every male person of full age who has statedly worshiped with such church, congregation or society and has formerly been considered as belonging thereto, shall be entitled to vote."

In the formation of a new society it would be best for the proposed corporators to be enrolled. Not only communicants but also non-communicants are privileged to unite as members of the corporation, and to vote for trustees who as already stated need not be communicants themselves.

2. *At subsequent elections.* Persons of full age of both sexes are permitted to vote. But after the first election the qualifications of voters become more definite. The Act of 1813 (§7) says, "That no person belonging to any church, congregation or society intended by the third section of this Act shall be entitled to vote at any election succeeding the first, until he shall have been a stated attendant on divine worship in said church, congregation or society, at least one year before said election, *and* shall have contributed to the support of the said church, congregation or society according to the usages and customs thereof: and that the clerk to the said trustees shall keep a register of the names of all such persons as shall desire to become stated hearers in the said church, congregation or society, and shall therein note the time when such request was made; and the said clerk shall attend all such subsequent elections in order to test the qualifications of such electors, in case the same should be questioned."

These are the statutory provisions as to the qualifications of

voters at an election for trustees, and the courts have decided that the qualifications of a voter as prescribed by the statute cannot be altered or abridged by the rules or by-laws of the society. Such regulations are a nullity. (People vs. Phillips 1 Denis' Reports, 388).

In the above quoted case the court said, "These sections prescribe the qualifications of electors, which in brief are these,

1. Membership. No one can be an elector who does not belong to such church, congregation or society.

2. He must have been for a year at least, a stated attendant on divine worship in said church, congregation or society.

3. He must have contributed to the support of the same according to the usages and customs thereof.

"These qualifications can neither be abridged or extended by any act of the trustees or corporators, but every person thus qualified has an incontestable right to vote at the election of trustees. The statute under which the incorporation was formed is its constitution, and every act in violation of this paramount law is necessarily invalid. This is a well settled principle of the common law and is of universal application to all corporations. * * Membership, worship and contribution carry with them as an inseparable incident the right to vote: for every such member is necessarily an elector."

The courts have also decided that the body corporate consists of every member of the congregation, whether professor or non-professor, who has a right to vote.

The Court of Appeals in the case of the Baptist Church in Hartford vs. Witherall, (3 Paige's Chancery Reports, 296). "The church consists of an indefinite number of persons, of one or both sexes, who have made a profession of religion; and who are associated together by a covenant of church fellowship for the purpose of celebrating the sacrament and watching over the spiritual welfare of each other. But a religious society or congregation, as recognized by the third section of the statute providing for the incorporation of religious societies, is with us what is usually denominated a poll parish in some of the neighboring states. It consists of a voluntary association of individ-

uals or families, united for the purpose of having a common place of worship, and to provide a proper teacher to instruct them in religious doctrines and duties and to administer the ordinance of baptism, &c. Although a church or body of professing Christians is almost uniformly connected with such a society or congregation, the members of the church have no other or greater rights than any other members of the society who statedly attend with them for the purposes of divine worship."

It was decided in the case of the People vs. the German United Evangelical St. Stephen's Church, of Buffalo, (53 New York Reports, 103) that a religious corporation may under its rules exclude a member from spiritual privileges, but it has no power to deprive him of his statutory rights as a corporator. In that case Christopher Dilcher had been expelled from the church with two others for false, fraudulent, scandalous and malicious representations as toward his pastor, Rev. Dr. Schelle. He had also been deposed by the congregation from the office of trustee. In an action to determine his *status*, the Court said, "The writ leaves it ambiguous as to what body passed the resolutions complained of by the relator, whether the corporation organized under the Act of 1813, which by the statute is vested with the property and control of the temporal affairs of the congregation, or that composed of those who have united together for ecclesiastical relations and purposes and for spiritual improvement, constituting what may properly be called the church." * * * "The resolutions passed by this body for the purpose of excluding the relator from the church and the spiritual privileges enjoyed by its members were effectual for the purpose intended, while if passed by the corporation for the purpose of depriving the relator of the privileges secured to the corporators by the statute were mere nullities." * * * "The latter has no power to try for any moral delinquency or to disfranchise a corporator in consequence thereof."

It was decided in the case of Watkins vs. Wilcox, (4 Hun's Reports, 220) that a corporator has a right to vote because he belongs to a particular society; not because he is connected with a particular denomination.

It was decided in the case of Petty vs. Tooker, (21 New

York Reports, 267) that the right of a corporator to vote, who possesses the requisite qualifications prescribed by the statute, is not forfeited by reason of his having renounced the doctrines recognized by the denomination to which the society belongs.

After the first election the qualification of voters is, (1) that they be of full age; (2) that they shall have been stated attendants on divine worship in such church at least one year before the election; (3) that they shall have contributed to the support of the church according to the usages and customs thereof.

In regard to attendance it was decided in the case of the People vs. Tuthill (31 New York Reports, 550) that stated attendance, to qualify a person to become a voter at an election held by a religious society after its first election, must be interpreted to mean the personal presence of the voter statedly at the religious meetings of the society. The regular attendance of the wife or other member of the family is not sufficient. Persons attending the religious meetings of the society but a few times in the course of a year, or only occasionally, though regular contributors to its support, are not voters within the meaning of the seventh section of the Act for the incorporation of religious societies.

In regard to the *contributions* for the support of the church, the court in the same case decided that the contribution and support must be according to the usages and customs of the society, which implies that the contributions must be of a vital and substantial character. The language of the court was, "Two things it will be seen must concur to qualify a person to become a voter at any such election, stated attendance on divine worship in the church, congregation or society, for the term of at least one year previous to the election, and contribution to the support of such church, congregation or society.

"The first question to be determined is, what constitutes stated attendance on divine worship? It is obviously something more than mere attendance. It is attendance of a particular nature or character. The term *stated* is used to characterize the nature or kind of attendance which shall confer one part of the qualfication or right. "Stated" as defined by Webster is "settled, established, regular, occurring at regular times, not oc-

casional: as stated hours of business." A stated attendant is one who attends statedly, which is defined to be, "regularly at certain times, not occasionally." The distinction between an attendant of that character and one whose attendance is irregular, and at uncertain periods, or occasionally only, is plain and well understood. Indeed it is too plain and obvious to be aided much by attempts at exact description or definition. Regular attendance, at the stated place for worship, as established in the church, or society or congregation as distinguishable from irregular or occasional attendance, is what is necessary. This attendance must be personal and cannot be supplied by another. The regular attendance of the wife, or other member of the family will not answer. And no amount of contribution to the support of a church or society can be accepted in lieu of this personal presence statedly. It is plain enough that the persons whose votes were challenged and rejected at the election in question, were not such attendants as the statute requires to constitute legal voters. For the year preceding the election, they had been, as clearly appears from evidence, irregular and occasional attendants, at most. Most of them seem to have been regular contributors to the support of the society for many years, but not regular attendants on divine worship for the year preceding. They had one qualification, but not both, and their votes were properly rejected. It is unnecessary to determine in this case how often a person must attend at the stated periods for worship, in the course of the year, to be a stated attendant. It is enough to say, that persons who attend a few times only in the course of the year, as compared with the number of stated times for worship within such year, and at irregular and uncertain intervals, are clearly not stated attendants."

"The next question is, in what manner a person must contribute to the support of such church or society, in order to be a qualified voter. He must contribute to its support according to the usages and custom thereof. This undoubtedly means substantial and vital aid and support. Personal attendance and countenance might in one sense contribute to the support of such an organization. But that is not the contribution intended by this provision of the statute. The statute means the neces-

sary, material support, without which the organization cannot exercise its ordinary functions and perform its customary and appropriate duties and ministrations. It means the parting with, and contribution of a portion of one's worldly substance, in the usual and customary way, to be used in meeting and defraying the expenses incurred by the church, congregation or society in the support of public and divine worship. Merely attending as a worshiper, or taking a leading or subordinate part, in the exercises, or rendering some special or gratuitous service will not answer this requirement of the statute. If the service rendered, however, is such as is usually and customarily hired and paid for by such organizations, and is by some understanding or agreement expressed or implied, rendered as an equivalent, or in lieu of a contribution in money or property, such service would undoubtedly be a contribution to the support of the church, society or congregation within the sense and meaning of the statute. The test is, does the contribution, whatever it may be go immediately and directly to the support of the public worship maintained by the church, congregation or society. In this view contributions made, not for the support and maintenance of the religious incorporation, but for the support and promotion of some other object or enterprise in which the church, congregation or society may be engaged, however valuable or praiseworthy, as Sunday-schools, missions and the like, will not be sufficient."

"The obvious and sensible policy of the statute was to secure the government and control of the temporalities of each of the religious incorporations formed under it, to such of its members or supporters as should manifest their attachment to its tenets and doctrines, and their interest in its success and usefulness by their habitual presence and countenance, and their habitual contributions to its support. It is quite plain, too, that upon no other principle or policy could these corporate bodies, depending as they do upon mere voluntary contributions for their maintenance and support, be permanently kept up, their existence continued, and their usefulness maintained. According to these views the General Term was right in holding that Phillip W. Tuthill and Ira B. Moore were not legal voters; neither of them

having, upon the undisputed evidence in the case, contributed to the support of that society for the previous year, according to any usage or custom thereof."

It was decided in the case of Cammeyer vs. The United German Lutheran Churches (2 Sandord's Chancery Reports, 208) that contributions for collateral objects are not sufficient. Services customarily paid for may however be rendered in lieu of contributions.

The inspectors of the election pass upon the qualification of the voters. It was decided in the case of Hartt vs. Harvey, (32 Barbour's Reports, 55) that if a vote is challenged and the inspectors pass upon the question as to the qualification of the elector, their decision is final. If they receive the vote, they have no power afterward to throw it out or take testimony in regard to its legality.

In the case of the People vs. Peck (11 Wendell's Reports, 605) it was decided that parol evidence of the number of persons present, entitled to vote at an election of trustees is admissable, although a regular register of the names of the stated hearers in the church, congregation or society may be kept by the clerk. This fact does not prevent the introduction of parol proof as to the number of the members of the church, congregation or society who are entitled to vote. The object of the register is to test their right to vote, and that seems to be the only use to which it is required to be put.

In the same case the court decided that an election of trustees of the church, congregation or society will be good, although the requirements of the statute in respect to the notice of such election may not have been complied with, providing the election was fairly conducted and there was no just complaint of want of notice. But if omissions were fraudulently made, or the election had been prejudiced by the omission of the statutory requirements, the election would be invalidated by the neglect. The statute must be liberally and reasonably construed for the benefit of the churches. So also the certificate of the election of the trustees to be given by the presiding officer is good, although not made out until months after the election. The presiding officers are required to certify the result of the election

immediately, but the statute in this case is directory merely, and the votes of the members cannot be made ineffectual by the neglect of the presiding officers.

Elections for trustees, subsequent to the first election, are to be conducted in the same manner as at the first, viz., two elders are to preside, or in their absence two members chosen by a plurality of votes, and the same certificate of election is to be executed.

In the case of the People vs. White, (11 Abbott's Practice Reports, 168) it was decided that after the ballots have been received, the right of the inspectors to inquire into the character of the voters ceases. Their only duty is to count the ballots and return the number of votes received.

It was decided in the case of the People vs. Tuthill, (31 New York Reports, 550) that if illegal votes were received, which did not change the result, the election can not be set aside on that account.

In the case of the People vs. Cook, (8 New York Reports, 67) it was decided that if the inspectors refuse the successful candidate a proper certificate, he will be entitled to the office notwithstanding such refusal. It is not the certificate, but the will of the electors that gives right to the office.

It was decided in the case of the People vs. Peck, (11 Wendell's Reports, 605) that an election of trustees would be irregular, if the persons specified in the statute be chosen to preside as inspectors of election were not selected. These persons as we have seen are two elders or church wardens; and if they are present they *must* be selected; but if there are no such church officers, or being such they are not present, then two members of the church or society may be nominated by a majority of the electors present to preside. A clergyman or preacher of the Baptist Church, though ordinarily called an elder, is not an elder within the meaning of the statute regulating these elections.

When a meeting has been called in accordance with the requirement of the statute, those present constitute a quorum, and their action will bind the corporation. The fact that strangers were present at a corporate meeting will not vitiate the proceedings, unless they voted, and their votes were necessary to

authorize their action. If the action of trustees is sanctioned by a majority of the corporators present at any meeting regularly held, it will not be necessary to show that they were a majority of all the corporators. (See Madison Avenue Baptist Church vs. Baptist Church in Oliver Street, 2 Abbott,s Practice Reports, 254.)

In the case of Field vs. Field, (9 Wendell's Reports, 394) the Court held, that where at a regular meeting, a presiding officer is prevented by violence from discharging his duties, he may retire with those who choose to follow him and conduct the meeting elsewhere.

The corporators who have a vote for trustees, also have a vote in fixing the salary of the minister.

Section 8 of the Act of 1813, reads as follows: "Nothing in this Act shall be construed or taken to give to any trustee of any church, congregation or society, the power to fix or ascertain any salary to be paid to any minister thereof, but the same shall be ascertained by a majority of the persons entitled to elect trustees, at a meeting to be called for that purpose, and such salaries when fixed, shall be ratified by the said trustees or a majority of them, by an instrument in writing under their common seal, which salary shall thereupon be paid by the trustees out of the revenues of the church, congregation or society."

This is all the power to vote conferred expressly by the statute upon corporators who are not communicant members of the congregation.

An effort commenced recently to apply the provisions of the law of 1822 for the incorporation of Reformed Presbyterian Churches to Lutheran Churches, which makes the minister, elders and deacons the trustees of the Church—thus barring the non-communicants from a voice and a vote in the government of the church, society or congregation, and giving them only a a voice on the question of salary and the rental of pews, if in fact it does that. The New York Ministerium, the New York and New Jersey Synod and the Hartwick Synod took action in favor of asking the legislature to pass an act, applying the provisions of that law of 1822 to such Lutheran Churches as may desire to avail themselves of such provisions.

Committees from the three bodies recently met in Albany, and they finally decided to ask the legislature to pass an act applying to Lutheran Churches the second section of the Act of 1813, which relates to the incorporation of Dutch Reformed Churches and which reads as follows:

§2. "And be it further enacted, that the minister or ministers and elders and deacons, and if at any time there be no minister, then the elders and deacons, during such time, of every Reformed Protestant Dutch church or congregation now or hereafter to be established in this state, and elected according to the rules and usages of such churches within this state, shall be the trustees for every such church or congregation: and it shall be lawful for the said trustees, if not already incorporated, to assemble together as soon as they shall deem it convenient, and execute under their hands and seals a certificate certifying the name or title by which they and their successors forever as a body corporate, by virtue of this act, shall be known and distinguished: which certificate being duly acknowledged or proved as aforesaid, shall be recorded by the clerk of such county, in a book to be by him provided as aforesaid: and such trustees and their successors shall thereupon by virtue of this Act, be a body corporate by the name or title expressed in such certificate: and it shall be lawful for the trustees of any such church or congregation, elected by virtue of any former law of this state, by writing under their hands and seals, to be proved, acknowledged and recorded as aforesaid, to declare their will not to continue any longer a body corporate, and thereupon such body corporate shall cease, and all the estate, real and personal, held by them shall pass to and be vested in the trustees of such church or congregation, made a body corporate in the manner above directed: *Provided always*, that nothing contained shall be construed in any manner to impair or alter the rights of any of the chartered churches within this state."

In response to this request the Legislature at the present session has already passed the following Act, which has been signed by the Governor, viz:

An Act to amend an Act, passed April fifth, eighteen hun-

dred and thirteen, entitled "An Act to provide for the incorporation of religious societies," extending the second section to apply to Evangelical Lutheran Churches.

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. That any Evangelical Lutheran church or congregation in this state, now incorporated under section three, chapter sixty, of the laws of eighteen hundred and thirteen, or hereafter to be incorporated, may incorporate itself in the mode prescribed in and by the second section of this Act, entitled "An Act to provide for the incorporation of religious societies," passed April fifth, eighteen hundred and thirteen.

SECTION 2. This Act shall take effect immediately.

New organizations will no doubt incorporate under the new law, and those now incorporated have an option whether they will remain under the general law or reincorporate under the new.

The state having made provision for the incorporation of religious societies and the election of trustees to represent their property interests, and directed how the compensation of religious teachers is to be determined, leaves the ecclesiastical polity of the organization to be determined according to its denominational affiliation. It can elect whatever spiritual officers it pleases, call them by whatever title they may choose, establish their own creed, adopt such forms of worship as may suit them, regulate the terms of membership and their mode of discipline and establish such spiritual courts as they may determine.

The state, through its courts, however, will hear the complaint of any member who claims that he is unjustly treated under the spiritual polity of the organization and if he be unjustly suspended or excommunicated, he can take the case before the civil tribunal, and the court will proceed according to the rules of the ecclesiastical organization by which it is governed, and if the member has been unjustly suspended or excommunicated, the court has power to afford relief and to decree to the officers of the society, or the society, that the judgment of suspension or excommunication be reversed and that the member be restored to his privileges. A refusal to obey the order of the court would be adjudged contempt of court, and be punished by fine or imprisonment, or both.

In the case of the People vs. Benevolent Society (Hun's Reports, 361) it was decided that a member of a benevolent society may resort to *mandamus* to restore him to membership in a corporation from which he had been unlawfully expelled.

II. WHO MAY VOTE FOR ELDERS AND DEACONS?

In the Lutheran Church the spiritual officers are elders and deacons, and their mode of election, their term of office and the qualification of voters must be determined by the ecclesiastical polity of the denomination. If the Synod with which the congregation is connected or the individual congregation have made no rule on the subject, then the "formula for the government and discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church" adopted and published by the General Synod would govern.

That formula provides in chapter 6, section 4, "At all elections for elders and deacons, no person shall be elected to either of said offices, who is not a member in full communion with said church.

In chapter 3, section 7, it says, "The elders and deacons are the representatives of the whole church, and each church shall determine the number of its officers and the term of their duration in office; yet in no case shall they serve less than two years nor more than eight, unless re-elected."

As these officers are elected at a congregational meeting, chapter 6, section 1, provides, "All congregational elections must be published by the church council to the congregation, at least two weeks before the election."

The qualifications of electors are specified in chapter 6, section 3, as follows: "The electors in any particular church in our connection, are all those who are in full communion with the same: who submit to its government and discipline regularly administered: who contribute according to their ability and engagements to all its necessary expenditures, and who have communed, unless providentially prevented, within one year preceding an election."

The law of the church here is less stringent than the law of the state, which requires that voters at an election for trustees and on the question of the pastor's salary be not only contributors, but also "stated" or regular attendants upon divine wor-

ship. A strict construction of the church rule would however debar a large number from voting, as many do not contribute to the expenses of the church according to their ability—many do not meet their engagements and promises in such support, and many neglect communion.

We see here that the law of the General Synod does not exclude minors nor females from voting for elders and deacons. It does not specify who shall preside at a congregational meeting. It is generally conceded that the pastor has that right. It provides that he, with the elders and deacons, shall constitute the church council—that he with a majority of the elders and deacons shall form a quorum, and that in his absence two thirds of the elders and deacons shall form a quorum. Where the notice for a congregational meeting has been regularly given by the church council, the members of the church, who are present, form a quorum.

The formula of the General Synod also provides in chapter 6, section 2, that, "The council may publish a congregational meeting for any lawful purpose when they shall deem it necessary: and they shall be compelled so to do, when requested by one third of the lawful electors of the church."

In order that it may be determined who the lawful electors of the church are the Formula in chapter 4, section 6, provides that, "It shall be the duty of the pastor or the church council to keep a complete list of all the communing members, the record of which shall be the property of the church."

The formula of the General Synod gives the church council the following power of nomination in chapter 6, section 6, viz: "At elections for members of the church council, the existing council shall nominate twice as many persons as are to be elected, and the church may nominate half as many more, if they deem it necessary, from whom the officers may be chosen."

The formula of the General Synod does not specify whether these officers shall be elected by ballot, by a rising vote, or *viva voce*. It would therefore devolve upon the meeting to determine in what mode their choice should be made.

These rules would govern in a court of law if difficulties

should arise, and there had been no different provision made by the particular church, or the district synod with which the church is connected. The courts of law will determine controversies relating to the spiritual government of a congregation by the rules of the denomination, and award to every one his rights under those rules.

As modifying the formula of the General Synod a district synod may recommend rules for the government of its congregations. In 1874 the New York and New Jersey Synod adopted a "Constitution for the government of the churches belonging to the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of New York and New Jersey." This constitution with few alterations has been adopted by the congregations, and new churches joining the synod are required as a prerequisite to adopt this constitution.

This constitution provides that there be three elders and three or six deacons—that they be chosen by ballot and that they be divided into three classes, so that one third of the number be chosen annually.

It provides that the pastor shall be *ex-officio* chairman of the church council—if he declines, then the senior elder is to act as chairman. A majority of the council comprises a quorum to transact business.

The qualifications of voters in the election of elders and deacons are prescribed in Article 4, Section 1, as follows, viz.: "Regular and fully qualified members of this congregation entitled to all the privileges of the church must be, 1. baptized and confirmed. 2. They must accept and maintain the doctrine of the Lutheran Church as set forth in article 3, (We receive and hold with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers, the word of God, as it is contained in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word, and the faith of our church founded upon that Word. We also adopt Luther's Smaller Catechism as the manual to be used in the religious education of our children). 3. They must depart from all iniquity (Gal. 5 : 19); lead a humble, holy and exemplary life; attend diligently upon the preaching of the word; partake reg-

ularly of the Lord's Supper; maintain secret devotion and family worship; contribute according to their ability and the usages of the congregation for the maintenance of public worship for the support of the ministry, the relief of the poor and all other benevolent operations of the church."

This is a very high standard of qualifications for voters—much higher than that prescribed by the formula of the General Synod, and if it were strictly enforced at an election the number of ballots cast would be small. Sometimes there are exciting issues at church elections, particularly in the election for pastor, and if members do not wish to be deprived of a vote, it behooves them to study carefully the qualification for voters prescribed by the constitution of their own church.

It will be seen that this constitution includes females and minors among its voters, as they are not excepted.

This constitution provides the following action in filling vacancies in Article 10, Section 5, viz.: "Should the place of any elder or deacon be vacated by death, resignation or otherwise, during the time between the annual elections, the remaining members of the council, or a majority of them, duly convened for the purpose, shall have power to fill the vacancy until the time of the next annual election."

This constitution provides for an annual congregational meeting for the election of officers, and it provides that special meetings may be called by the pastor, the trustees, the church council, or by any twelve members of the congregation, by giving public notice from the pulpit. (Article 14, Section 2).

The Franckean Synod has the following chapter in its constitution on elections, viz.:

1. All elections shall be made by a majority of the votes of the male members in good and regular standing.

2. The electors of this church are those only who are in full communion with the same; who submit to its discipline and do contribute to the support of the pastor, and all other necessary expenditures of the church, according to their ability and engagements, within one year preceding any election.

3. No person shall be elected to the office of deacon, who is not a member in full communion with the church.

4. All elections for a pastor and deacons shall be published by the council at least two weeks or two successive Sabbaths before the election.

5. When an election is held for pastor, two thirds of all the electors present shall be necessary to an election, and they shall also at the same time fix, ascertain and determine the amount of salary and other necessary support. A certificate of said election, signed by the chairman shall be a sufficient warrant to the members of the church council to make out and sign a call.

The Hartwick Synod has not formulated and adopted any rules in regard to church elections.

### III. ELECTION OF A PASTOR.

The formula of the General Synod makes this provision for the election of a pastor in chapter 6, section 5, "When an election is held in a vacant congregation for a pastor, two thirds of all the electors present shall be necessary to an election; and if the votes were not unanimous, it is recommended that the presiding officer shall invite the minority to concur in the decision."

The constitution recommended by the New York and New Jersey Synod and the Franckean Synod also provide for a two-thirds vote of those present. Whether the vote shall be by *viva voce*, rising or ballot is not prescribed, and hence any mode would be valid.

### IV. ELECTION OF DELEGATE TO SYNOD.

As synods are found to be necessary for the welfare of the church, and as in the Lutheran Church the lay element has an equal voice with the clergy, it devolves upon each church to elect a delegate to Synod to take part in the legislation of the church.

The formula of the General Synod in defining the duties of the church council says, "they shall also elect one of their number a deputy to represent them at the annual synodical meeting."

The constitution recommended by the New York and New Jersey Synod is broader in its range, but it still gives the power of election to the church council. It says, "The council shall appoint from the members in full communion in the church one

person as a lay delegate to represent the congregation at the annual synodical meeting."

It would seem a better way to convene the congregation, and let them choose a delegate to represent them in synod.

A knowledge of the law of church elections is often of great practical importance, as difficulties sometimes arise in the churches, parties form, and each side endeavors to succeed in the election.

At the Easter election in 1881, of Christ Episcopal Church, Cooperstown, N. Y., there was much interest in the election and two sets of men claimed to have been elected wardens of that church. Those who were declared *not* elected brought an action in the Supreme Court, asking that the Court would declare in their favor and oust the incumbents. The case was tried at the Otsego Circuit in September, 1881, before Judge Follett, both parties having waived a jury. The plaintiffs claimed that illegal votes were allowed for the defendants and that the plaintiffs had a majority of the legal votes cast. The defendants denied that illegal votes were cast for them, and they in return charged that two illegal votes were cast for the plaintiffs.

Judge Follett gave a written opinion and struck out three votes that had been given for the defendants, which left the vote 22 for the defendants and 21 for the plaintiffs. The case was dismissed and judgment was entered against the plaintiffs with $136.41 costs.

The case was appealed to the general term, but settled between the parties before argument. The trial developed the following facts in regard to some of the members:

Theodore Ernst, when an infant was baptized in the Episcopal Church, and in July, 1860, was duly confirmed therein. His name appears upon the list of communicants of Christ Church, in which he had received the holy communion, though not for two years prior to the election. His family attended this church, but he had not over five or six times during the year. He had neither owned nor rented a pew. He had not contributed to the support of the church during the year preceding the election.

Frank P. Kendall was baptized and confirmed in the Episco-

pal Church in 1869 or 1870. His name appeared upon the list of communicants of Christ Church, in which he had received the holy communion, though not for five years preceding the election. He had attended this church at least twenty times during the year, but not regularly from August to Easter, the time of the election. He had not owned or rented a pew for several years. For two months preceding the election he had attended the Presbyterian Church with considerable regularity and on a few occasions other churches in the village.

Richard Worthington was baptized in Christ Church Oct. 15, 1866. His name appears upon the list of communicants, though he had never received the holy communion. He may have attended the church and joined in the service by the use of the prayer book, fifteen times during the year, but had more frequently attended the Presbyterian Church. He had not purchased or hired a pew or seat within five years, and for the last three years had not occupied the pew of his father's family. He had attended the Universalist Church at least twelve times during the year and the Baptist Church occasionally.

Lee B. Crittenden was baptized in the Episcopal Church at Morris when an infant and confirmed in the same church in 1863. His wife and children had been baptized in the church and his wife confirmed. He had not received the holy communion for two or three years before the election, and during that time he had not attended the church more than ten times; or five times a year; and he had never hired or purchased a pew. His wife did not attend more than he did.

Walter H. Bunn was baptized in the Episcopal Church in Morris about 1852, but had never been confirmed or a communicant of any church. From 1873 to 1880 he hired and paid for a pew, and his name appears upon the list of pew-holders, but does not appear upon the list of pew-holders for 1880 and 1881, though he says he supposed he was a pew-holder and his family and himself occupied the same pew when at church. He had attended church about twelve times during the year preceding the election.

Judge Follett refused to strike their names from the list of

those who had voted at the election. If he had done so, it would have given the control of the church to the other party. In the appeal to the General Term Mr. Lynes, the attorney for the plaintiffs, says, "None of them had attended service to exceed twenty times out of more than one hundred regular Sunday services. Not one of them had hired a pew or seat for several years, if ever, except Mr. Bunn. Not one had partaken of the holy communion within the year. So they had not contributed to sustain the church either by their presence or money for the year preceding the election."

A few years ago the trustees of the Wurtemburg Lutheran Church, in Dutchess County, brought an action in ejectment against the trustees of the school district as trespassers upon the church property. There was a great diversity of opinion in the congregation on the propriety of bringing the action. The school house had been many years upon the church ground, and there was a disposition on the part of the district to claim the ground by adverse possession. Many of the congregation were residents of the school district and interested in both corporations. The requisite number of members asked for a congregational meeting—which was convened—and at that meeting a motion was made that the trustees of the church be directed to withdraw the action against the trustees of the school district. The meeting had called out the full membership of the church, and the question arose as to who were the legal voters. It was claimed by some that on this question, which involved the temporalities of the church, that all persons who under the statute could vote for trustees were entitled to vote.

The church had adopted the constitution recommended by the New York and New Jersey Synod, and the chairman of the congregational meeting decided that, under it, minors and females could vote if they had communed within a year unless providentially prevented and who had during the year contributed to the support of the church—that the contribution of the head of the family covered other members of the family who lived with the parents—that no one, not a member of the church, although a contributor could claim any more rights than the statute and the constitution of the church gave him, which was

the right to vote for trustees and on the question of the pastor's salary, and hence that on the motion before the meeting they had no voice—that no voting rights were to be accorded to them by inference.

Upon the qualification of voters in church elections we may therefore make the following summary, viz :

1. That the statute gives the right to vote for trustees, and to vote upon the question of the pastor's salary, to all persons male and female of full age who are stated attendants upon the services of the church, and who contribute to its expenses, according to the customs and usages of the church.

2. That the right to vote for elders, deacons and pastor, and upon all questions that come before a congregational meeting, except the election of trustees and fixing the pastor's salary, depends upon the rule adopted, (1) By the constitution of the particular church ; (2) If the particular church has not adopted a constitution and by-laws, then the question will be determined by the rule adopted by the district synod with which the church is connected ; (3) If the particular church has no constitution or by-laws and the district synod with which it is connected has adopted no rule on the subject, then the question of the qualification of the voter must be determined by the "formula for the government and discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church" adopted by the General Synod.

## ARTICLE VIII.

### SOME ITEMS OF LUTHERAN CHURCH HISTORY.*

By Rev. J. E. Bushnell, A. M., Roanoke, Va.

In 1859 the Rev. Lewis Frederick Eichelberger, D. D., completed an "Outline History of Lutheranism." The manuscript, now in my possession, covers seven hundred large and closely written pages. While negotiating for its publication, the author was called to his heavenly reward and the history was never published. Some notes in this connection may be of service to the Church, and certain portions of the manuscript will be used to show the status of American Lutheranism twenty-five years ago. The proposed union meeting at Roanoke city, June 23rd, adds interest to the study of our synodical history, as presented in this review.

Lewis Frederick Eichelberger was born in Frederick Co., Md., on the 25th of August, 1803. At an early age he was placed in the school of Rev. Dr. Schaeffer, at Frederick. Subsequently he was sent to Georgetown, D. C., where he attended the classical school of Dr. Carnahan, who afterward became distinguished as President of Princeton College. From Georgetown, Mr. Eichelberger went to Dickinson College, at Carlisle, Pa., where he graduated in 1826. Among his classmates at Dickinson were the lamented Dr. Baugher, second President of Pennsylvania College, and George Buchanan, a brother of the 15th President of the United States. Mr. Buchanan received the first honor of his class. The second honor was divided between Messrs. Baugher and Eichelberger. From college he at once removed to the newly organized Theological Seminary at Gettysburg and became a member of the first class formed in that institution, and one of its first graduates. While a student at Gettysburg, Mr. Eichelberger was invited to become the pastor of the Lutheran Church at Winchester, Va. In 1849 he was

*Gathered from the MS. remains of Rev. L. F. Eichelberger, D. D.

elected Professor of Theology in the Seminary at Lexington, South Carolina. "In 1853," says Dr. Morris*—a fellow-student with Dr. Eichelberger in the first class of the Gettysburg Seminary—"his position and attainments were suitably recognized by one of the oldest and most influential literary institutions of our country. The honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred by Princeton College. He resigned his professorship in March 1858, and immediately returned to Winchester, warmly welcomed by many ardent friends. His time, however, was not without its appropriate employment. He eagerly seized the leisure at his disposal for the execution of a long cherished purpose to prepare for the press a compact and popular "History of the Lutheran Church," for which he had made extensive preparation in the collection of materials, and the sketching of chapters, as other duties permitted, or other pursuits and studies furnished opportunities. Although frequently interrupted by illness and much disabled by bodily weakness, he yet lived to finish his last work of love.

He was to the Lutheran Church a faithful, self-denying servant. Death found him with the harness still on, ready to do or die as the Lord might order. His death was peace, was triumph. It was a privilege which shall never be forgotten, to see his heavenly composure, and to hear his dying utterances. When he had but strength to whisper a few words at a time, he said to a brother in the ministry: "Christ is a precious Saviour; he does more than he promises for his dying followers. Go preach to sinners; Christ will save them all. Nothing but Christ will do in death."

In addition to his labors as preacher and teacher, Dr. Eichelberger was the editor and proprietor of a weekly paper, *The Virginian*, at Winchester. He also edited and published, from 1833–35, a monthly periodical known as *The Evangelical Lutheran Preacher and Pastoral Messenger*, which presented sermons and occasional articles on doctrinal and practical subjects, by leading ministers of the Lutheran Church. Drs. Schaeffer, Miller, Hazelius, Baugher, Strobel, Endress and the editor were among the principal writers.

*Fifty Years in Luth. Min., p. 190.

"The History of the Lutheran Church" was Dr. Eichelberger's great work, and in this day and time we may do well to note the record and reflections made twenty-five years ago. On page 599, the constitution and relation of the General Synod is taken up. Now that the whole Church, north and south, east and west, is praying for a closer union in the bonds of a common faith, the history of the old "General Synod" as given by Dr. Eichelberger deserves some attention. He believed that the whole Church ought to be united in the spirit of genuine love in the one general body, which was the first formed.

The General Synod was organized Oct. 24, at Hagerstown, Md., seventy-two years after the formation of the Synod, and Ministerium of Pennsylvania, which was the first and for many years the only Lutheran Synod in the United States. The object of the General Synod was to unite the existing district synods and to thus give the church generally more harmony, efficiency and success in the work of the Redeemer's kingdom. All the district synods (except the recently formed synod of Ohio) were united in the organization of the General Synod. Of the synods organized between 1820 and 1859 the great majority were united in the one general body.

The following twenty-five constituted the general body which met at Pittsburg, in 1859, as reported by Dr. Eichelberger: The Synod of Pennsylvania, West Pennsylvania, East Pennsylvania, Central Pennsylvania, Pittsburg, New York, Hartwick, Maryland, English Synod of Ohio, Miami, Wittenberg, Olive Branch, Illinois, Northern Illinois, Southern Illinois, Northern Indiana, English District Synod of Ohio, Kentucky, Iowa, Virginia, Western Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Melanchthon Synod. The four synods of Central Pennsylvania, Northern Indiana, Southern Illinois and Iowa, were admitted into the General Synod in 1857, and the Melanchthon Synod in 1859. This shows, says our author, a growing interest and confidence, on the part of the Church, in the general body. The Synods of Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland and North Carolina, constituted originally the General Synod, and through their delegates united in its formation. These four synods then in-

cluded 99 ministers, and the whole number of our ministers in the United States was only 140.

In 1859 the General Synod included 719 ministers, with 1378 congregations. The whole number of our ministers in the United States was 1083, with 1920 congregations. "We see," says Dr. Eichelberger, "the rapid increase in the number of our ministers and churches since the organization of the General Synod, and to which the well ordered and wholesome influence of that efficient and conservative body has no doubt greatly contributed."

The synods not included in the General Synod, in 1859, were as follows: 1. The Joint Synod of Ohio; 2. The Tennessee Synod; 3. Indiana; 4. Wisconsin; 5. Missouri; 6. Indianapolis; 7. Michigan; 8. German Synod of Iowa; 9. Buffalo; 10. Franckean. The Joint Synod of Ohio included the following five district synods: The Northern, Eastern, Western, Southern and English District Synods. These synods included 364 ministers, and 542 congregations. "The hope is," says Dr. Eichelberger, "that these synods, laying aside minor differences, may all eventually unite with the other synods in promoting, as one body, the welfare and common interests of the whole Lutheran Church. The organization of the General Synod is probably as complete and free from objection, as it could be made, and no good reason exists why all may not unite in it. If improvement can be made, let all then unite in making it, and none will doubtless more redily concur, than those synods now constituting the General Synod."

The constitution of the General Synod which was adopted at Hagerstown and signed by delegates Schmucker, Geissenhainer, Muhlenberg, Lochman, Endress, Kunkel, Hensel and Stichter, of Pennsylvania, Schaeffer and Mayer, of New York, Schmucker and Shober, of North Carolina, and Schaeffer, Kurtz and Schryock of Maryland, is examined article after article by Dr. Eichelberger and approved as follows, in conclusion: "Its provisions are not only strictly scriptural in their character, but such that the large number of synods included in it, and the churches represented, have wisely approved and sanctioned. Being no church judicatory and constituted only as an advisory

body, as was right and best it should be, leaving all authority and control to the synods themselves, it is clear that their can be no serious ground of objection to the general body, and that the way is freely open for the whole Lutheran Church to be united in promoting the object designed originally in its formation. *The hope is, as already stated, that this union may still be effected, and that all of our synods, in the spirit of Christian love and fellowship, laying aside all minor differences and governed only by what is believed to be essential and fundamental in religion, may still come to approve and sanction it. In the mean time, let us all as Christian brethren, learn to bear in meekness our supposed differences, till permitted to see eye to eye in regard to them, and still pray and labor on in the spirit of Christ and according to the grace given us, in promoting the cause of truth and holiness and in building up the Redeemer's kingdom in the world.*"

Three years after Dr. Eichelberger wrote the words quoted above, the "spirit of Christian love and fellowship" fled before the face of internecine strife. Those who had met together in the name of the Prince of Peace met in battle array. The songs of Zion were silenced by the trumpet of war.

The report of the 31st convention of the General Synod contains the following note: "It will be seen that the first decrease in component district synods was in 1862, when the Southern Synods were not represented, because of the war then prevailing; since that time they have not returned"

The amended constitution which was adopted in 1869 at Washington, however, declares that the General Synod shall "be sedulously and incessantly regardful of the circumstances of the times, and of every casual rise and progress of unity of sentiment among Christians in general, in order that the blessed opportunities to promote concord and unity and the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, may not pass by neglected and unavailing." The same language is used in the revised constitution of the General Synod (South). More than this, the whole Church is praying for union in the bonds of love and the Lord is bringing us nearer together every day. The church papers abound in expressions of fraternal regard. The *Observer*, *Evangelist*, *Lutheran*, *Workman*, *Our Church Paper*, and *Visitor*,

contain the most encouraging promises of organic union in love and labor for our entire English Lutheran Church.

The basis approved by the Salisbury Diet presents a platform upon which our Churches may unite in the most fraternal fellowship. We need an outward expression of that spiritual unity which already exists. "Let the prayers of the whole brotherhood go up to God for true unity and peace." It will be a grand triumph for American Lutheranism if those synods which first withdrew from the general body should become in turn the recognized leaders in a complete removal of those divisions for which the Southern Synods are in part responsible.

In 1853 the General Synod which met in Winchester, Va., included 20 synods and 102 delegates, representing the undivided strength of the first general organization. This was, however, the last meeting of northern delegates upon southern soil in full organic union.

Letters in hand, with the assurances through the papers, warrant the conclusion that the meeting at Roanoke can inaugurate a successful re-union of the entire English Church.

"According to your faith, be it unto you." The loving Jesus, who prayed that we might be one in him, can open the blind eyes to see the full promise of grace.

---

## ARTICLE IX.

### NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

WARREN F. DRAPER, ANDOVER, MASS.

*The Book of Daniel;* or the Second Volume of Prophecy. Translated and expounded, with a preliminary sketch of Antecedent Prophecy, by James G. Murphy, LL. D. and D. D., T. C. D., Professor of Hebrew. pp. 206. 8vo. 1885.

This book is not a commentary on Daniel in the ordinary sense of the word. Its object is rather to expound the Messianic contents of Daniel, not only in themselves, but also in their connection with the Messianic contents of earlier revelation. It accordingly begins with the Protevangelium of Genesis III. and follows up the promises of God concerning the Messianic future, and all of these down to the time of the captivity are included in a preliminary discourse covering 68 pages and called the First

volume of Prophecy. This historical survey of prophetic, and especially Messianic prediction, does not endeavor to show the gradual unfolding of these ideas in their relations to each other, but rather the positive contents of the several promises of God. The author does not seek to develop a fixed theory of the Messianic ideas of the Old Testament, but only to state what these were and their historical order. The preliminary discourse is in some respects of greater interest than the book proper. The Book of Daniel is then taken up, analyzed and its Messianic features drawn out. In doing so the author evinces a thoroughly conservative spirit and a respectable scholarship. He does not to any marked extent enter upon the discussion of the critical questions hovering over this book, and for that reason especially the Introduction, p. 71–82, is the least satisfactory part of the volume. No book of the Bible has received a firmer historical background through modern historical research than has the book of Daniel through the discoveries of the Assyriologists, and excellent use of these results might have been made, although this does not affect the immediate purpose of the volume. The fault of the work is thus one rather of omission. But as it is, the pastor, Sunday-school teacher and other intelligent readers of God's word will find in it much of value.

J. C. HINRICH'S, LEIPZIG.

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURG. SCRIBNER & WELFORD, NEW YORK.

*Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, von Emil Schürer, Zweiter Theil.* A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, by Emil Schürer. Second Division, translated by Sophia Taylor and Rev. Peter Christie. 2 Volumes. 1886.

This work is both *multum* and *multa*. It is a rare occurrence that a theological book leaves the press in which is to be found so much material for study and at the same time so well arranged and digested, as is the case in this volume. It is the second part of his work on the "History of the New Testament Times," which appeared in German about twelve years ago, and which at once established the young professor's reputation as an accurate and shrewd critic. The scope and object of the work is to surround the New Testament with all the historical agencies and factors which made up the world of thought and life in Israel in the days of early Christianity and the composition of the New Testament books. It aims to represent and reproduce the New Testament age as far as Israel is concerned in its political, theological, social and other respects, and thus furnish for the early promulgation and records of the Gospel that historical framework and background without which these cannot be fully understood and appreciated. Accordingly Schürer has examined all the sources of information which can throw any light upon this most important era in the history of the world; he has searched through the literary remains of contemporary and later Roman and Greek literature, through the Jewish Targumim,

Midrashim, Mishna, Talmuds and similar works, through Josephus and Philo, through the apocrypha, the apocalypses, &c., and has drawn from them a flood of light for the problem he has in hand. His method is to give both the processes and the results: he quotes from the authorities hundreds of longer and shorter extracts and refers to hundreds of others for the individual lines that enter into the composition of the whole picture, and thus enables his readers to examine into the merits of the case themselves, and to accept his conclusions only when warranted by the facts which he mentions to substantiate them. In this manner the work becomes a storehouse of useful information on numerous subjects suggested by New Testament Introduction, New Testament Theology and the exegesis of the separate books, notably the Gospels and the Acts. The wealth of the contents of these volumes is seen when we mention that among the subjects treated are the general culture and civilization among the Jews in the time of Christ, with special reference to the conflict between conservative Judaism and Hellenistic progressive ideas; further to the Scribes, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Essenes, together with the peculiarities of their faith and confessions; the Life under the Law; the Messianic Hope; the Jews of the Dispersion and the Proselytes; the Literature, both of the Palestino-Jewish as well as the Hellenistico-Jewish, and other allied subjects. The volume which has so far appeared is really the second, and treats of the internal condition of the Jews; the first volume, promised by the author for the close of the present year, will treat of the External or Political History of the Jews during this period. The two volumes of the English translation embrace only two-thirds of the second volume of the German; a third volume, completing the translation of this part, is announced as in press. The translation is an unsatisfactory piece of work, especially is this the case with the portions done by Miss Taylor. It was evidently very hastily done and with an imperfect knowledge of the finer features of German syntax. It is about time for the translators of German theological works, especially those who have been engaged on the Clark series, to learn that a knowledge of the subject matter is absolutely necessary to a faithful version and that under circumstances the average German-English dictionary is the most treacherous friend a translator may have. The terminology of modern German theology is like that theology itself, *sui generis*, and a translation word for word into English is simply an impossibility, because the ideas the German terms convey are foreign to the English language and theology, which accordingly have no exact equivalents for them. The difficulties in this respect were smaller in the case of Schürer's work as this is historical and not ethical or dogmatical, and the poor quality of the work done is accordingly without excuse. The critical student will be compelled to use the German and not the English work. We would, however, remark that the translation improves as it progresses, and

toward the close is quite fair. Especially is this true of Rev. Christie's portions.

We would not, however, be understood as pronouncing Schürer's work absolutely perfect. In the nature of the case it can be only relatively exhaustive. It must especially be noted that he has seemingly paid little attention to the theological literature of America, and that in his adherence to the modern radical school of Old Testament critics, he has given an unhistorical basis to section 24, on the Priesthood and Temple Worship. But taken as a whole the book is certainly one of the most remarkable and noteworthy that has appeared for a decade.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

*The Pentateuch, its Origin and Structure, an Examination of Recent Theories.* By Edwin Cone Bissell, D. D., Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature in the Hartford Theological Seminary. pp. iv., 484. 8vo. 1885.

The critical theories on the Old Testament, which have already had a century's history in German theological circles, have found their way to America in the most radical shape imaginable. Especially through the literary works and the trials of Robertson Smith, of Scotland, English and American theology has been attracted to these theories and their advocates. While the views of Graff, Wellhausen, Kuenen, Smith and *confreres* are not at all to be identified with Old Testament criticism as such, and while the latter theological discipline is not to be condemned because these advocates have pronounced such revolutionary views in its name, it is yet true that the majority of Old Testament writers, technically so called in Germany and Holland, where such criticism is most at home, are adherents of these most advanced views, and it is against this school accordingly, as now present and most influential, that Professor Bissell has directed his able work. *In nuce* this theory claims that Israel's religion is a natural product and not a divine revelation; that from purely natural premises it grew and developed in a manner perfectly intelligible on natural premises; that the Levitical laws, ordinances and sacrifices, which are according to the traditional views the starting point of Israel's religious development, are really the end and outcome thereof; and that the greater part of the Pentateuch is a post-exilic production. Professor Bissell examines into the claims of this visionary theory and finds it without foundation, reason or logic. While not hiding from himself the fact, that according to accepted views of the Church on the character of the Old Testament religion and the composition of the books in which this religion and its growth are recorded, there are difficulties in abundance remaining for the conscientious student of God's word to solve, he shows conclusively that the new hypothesis and the proposed reconstruction of Old Testament literature and religion is a tissue of contradictions

and impossibilities from beginning to end. He has done his work well, though at times he preaches where he ought to teach. His list of literature on the Pentateuch and the theories of Old Testament critics is the most complete ever published, and forms a valuable addition to the work.

AMERICAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, CHICAGO.

*Elements of Hebrew by an Inductive Method.* By William R. Harper, Ph. D., Professor of Hebrew in the Chicago Baptist Union Theological Seminary.

The author of this manual is well known as one of the most enthusiastic students of Hebrew in the country, as also one of the most successful teachers of this language. He is the leading member of the American Institute of Hebrew, is the principal of the Summer Schools of this institute, is the editor of the "Old Testament Student," and of the "Hebraica," and the founder and manager of the Correspondence School of Hebrew in Morgan Park, near Chicago. His work in the department of Hebrew has been very marked, and to him more than to any other single man in America must be attributed the remarkable revival of interest in the study of the venerable language of the Old Testament that is now so decided in the theological seminaries and publications of the country. "Elements of Hebrew" from such a source are entitled to special consideration, particularly when the book is in itself such an excellent production. The grammar of Professor Harper differs *toto coelo* from all others in existence. Its method is the inductive. Taking the first eight chapters of Genesis as a basis, he summons up the grammatical facts presented by the chapters, and having systematically arranged these, he deduces from them the grammatical principles they involve and illustrate. In this manner the pupil is taught to construct and to understand his grammer just as he proceeds. Experience with this method in the various summer schools of Hebrew, as also its adoption by many of the leading seminaries of the country, have demonstrated its superiority over other systems. A deeper examination of Harper's work shows that its method and character are the result of a happy combination of a thorough theoretical knowledge of the language and a close observation of the needs of the class-room. The only possible objection that might be urged to the grammar is that more attention is paid to the elucidation and illustration of the part treating on orthography, particularly to the vowel system, than might not seem to be called for in a work claiming to treat only of the elements of the Hebrew. However the more advanced pupil, or also the teacher of Hebrew will probably find just these sections the richest mines for study.

H. REUTHER, CARLSRUHE AND LEIPZIG. B. WESTERMANN, NEW YORK.

*Arabic Grammar, Paradigmus, Literature, Chrestomathy and Glossary.* By. Dr. A. Socin, Professor in the University of Tübingen. 1885.

*Hebrew Grammar with Exercises, Literature and Vocabulary.* By Herman L. Strack, Ph. D., D. D., Professor in the University of Berlin.

We are glad to bring to the attention of our readers these two elementary grammars, kindly sent us by the authors. They are intended to offer to the beginner everything he needs for a first acquaintance with the two most important Semitic languages. Strack's Hebrew grammar was written especially for those who commence Hebrew later in their course or without a teacher. The two grammars open the second revised edition of the series of Petermann's "*Porta Linguarum Orientalium*," and the whole series now appears in both the German and the English. The authors are among the leading oriental scholars in Germany. Some acquaintance with one or more of the Semitic dialects is necessary to the student who desires to secure more than a mechanical knowledge of the Hebrew, and this series of books of which others on the other languages of this family are to follow, offers him exactly what he needs by way of introduction. It is to be regretted that the traslation of Socin's book is not what the merits of the work deserve, the version being too much under the spell of the original German. The translation of Strack's work is excellent.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

*A Library of Religious Poetry.* A collection of the best poems of all ages and tongues. With biographical and literary notes. Edited by Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., and Arthur Gilman, M. A. pp. 1004. 1885.

It is delightful to find a work of this character compiled and edited by men so notably competent for their task as these editors. Where the highest and holiest productions of literature are to be gathered, sifted and classified, the public demands in advance that it be done by men in whose learning, thoroughness, refinement, discrimination and catholicity the most implicit confidence can be placed. Dr. Schaff and Mr. Gilman fully meet these requirements. They have accordingly produced a work that is not only unsurpassed but, we believe, unsurpassable. They have brought together in this superb octavo the best poems of all ages and tongues, a vast treasury of the most precious gems that poetic inspiration has contributed to devout and believing hearts. A very convenient topical arrangement has been made which with the index of first lines will enable the reader easily to find any selection that he may wish.

It is a book which can be taken up in every frame of mind; which will prompt to nobler and holier living, which will comfort the sorrow-

ing and cheer the mourner; which Christian friends will delight to read to each other at the fireside; which old and young will take pleasure in consulting for intellectual and spiritual aids; which is worthy of a place close by the family Bible and which will be found one of the best commentaries of the Bible ever written. It is the Bible in song.

*Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Gospels of Mark and Luke.* By Heinrich Augustus Wilhelm Meyer, Th. D., Consistorialrath, Hannover. Translated from the Fifth Edition of the German by Rev. Robert Ernest Wallis, Ph. D. The translation revised and edited by William P. Dickson, D. D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasglow. With a Preface, translation of References, and Supplementary notes to the American Edition by Matthew B. Riddle, D. D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Hartford Theological Seminary. pp. 598. 1884.

*Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Epistle to the Galatians.* By the same. Translated from the Fifth Edition of the German by G. H. Venables. *Critical and Exegetical Hand-book the to Epistle to the Ephesians.* By the same. Translated from the Fourth Edition of the German by Rev. Maurice J. Evans, B. A. The Translation revised and edited by William P. Dickson, D. D., bound in one volume, with Galatians both edited with a Preface, translation of References, and Supplementary Notes to the American Edition by Henry E. Jacobs, D. D., Professor Systematic Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church at Philadelphia, and late Professor of the Greek Language and Literature, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.

*Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians*, and to Philemon. By the same. Translated from the Fourth Edition of the German by Rev. John C. Moore B. A. The translation revised and edited by William P. Dickson, D. D. Bound with this in a volume of 638 pp. *Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Epistles to the Thessalonians.* By Dr. Gottlieb Lüneman, Professor of Theology in the University of Göttingen. Translated from the German by Rev. Paton J. Gloag, D. D. All embraced in the volume being edited with a preface and Supplementary Notes to the American Edition by Timothy Dwight, Professor of Sacred Literature in Yale College.

There are four points for special congratulation in connection with the appearance of Meyer's Commentary in this country. First, the enterprise and judgment of the publishers in undertaking the great work. Second, their selection of the foremost American Biblical Scholars for the revision of the respective portions. Third, the prompt appearance of the successive volumes. Fourth, the liberal appreciation of the work on the part of clergy and theological students. Biblical study has

received an incalculable impulse from the widespread circulation of this standard of scientific exegesis. An agreeable feature in the volume on Mark and Luke, according to Meyer's anti-harmonistic views, is the fact of a complete exposition of every passage, thus sparing one the provocation often encountered when consulting a commentary on Mark or Luke and finding simply a reference to the interpretation of the the passage in the commentary on Matthew in the same series.

Prof. Riddle has also greatly enriched this volume by incorporating in the "Supplementary Notes," many of the views and comments of Dr. Weiss, the distinguished reviser of Meyer. Instead of being substituted for Meyer's work as was done by Weiss in the original, they are here simply added, leaving Meyer's expositions intact. In the Clark's edition Weiss' contributions are ignored.

It was fitting to have the revision of the *Hand-book to the Epistle to the Galatians* as well as that to the Ephesians entrusted to Lutheran hands and none could have been found with more skill and more familiarty with what may be called the Lutheran Epistle. To it and to the kindred epistle to the Romans, as Meyer himself truly said, we owe most directly the springing up and the development of the ideas and energies of the Reformation. Luther, who in his commentary on Galatians brought out into the clearest light the fundamental Protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone, naively says of it: "The Epistle to the Galatians is my epistle. I have betrothed myself to it. It is my wife."

Dr. Jacobs has traversed the German revision which Sieffert made of Galatians and that made by Schmidt of Ephesians, including in his notes their more important deviations from Meyer, supplementing these with original and selected observations calculated to correct what are deemed errors in the last edition from the original author.

The demand for Meyer's *Hand-buch* was so great in Germany during the author's life, that his time was absorbed in the successive revisions of the original volumes and he was consequently unable to complete the exposition of all the books of the New Testament, and the volume comprising Philippians, Colossians and Philemon was the last of the series from his own pen. The Epistles to the Thessalonians which here appear in connection with the former in one volume are the labor of a worthy coadjutor, Prof. Lüneman of Göttingen. The scholarly student soon discovers, indeed, that he has no longer before him the interpretations of a genius, yet Lüneman may be credited, if in a degree inferior to Meyer, with great learning, independence of judgment, exegetical insight and lucidity of expression.

CHARLES L. WEBSTER & COMPANY, NEW YORK.

*Personal Memoirs of U. S. Grant.* In Two Volumes. Vol. I. pp. 584. 1885.

If the great military success of General Grant failed to convince any one of his genius, the literary quality of these memoirs ought to dispel

the most stubborn doubt. That a man whose youth was passed behind the plow in the backwoods, whose later years were divided between the rude scenes of a soldier's life on the frontier, the carnage of the battlefield and the turmoil and engrossments of political life, should pen a work marked by the highest literary excellence, reveals a grade of endowments far above the common line.

The very elements of greatness which distinguished the soldier, discover themselves also to a marked degree in the author. There is no affectation, no showiness, no egotism, but a union of simplicity, candor and strength which is destined, apart from its historical and personal interest, to secure for the work the rank of an American classic. Even the quiet humor which is never wanting to genius, however taciturn, meets you here and again, as for instance, in the experience with his first uniform and in his refusal when President to give a Southern manufacturer of "C. S. A." tent cloth, a statement of the fact that his establishment was burnt by National troops, to be used in pressing his claim before Congress.

No feature of these memoirs is more striking than their kindly spirit toward every one. The bitter rivalries of the army and the rancorous heartburnings shown by generals of high rank find no place here. There is not a harsh word against the South, not a breath of animosity towards any superior or inferior officer. Mistakes and failures are candidly stated by the author, his own as frankly as others, but there is no harsh criticisms, no smarting over injuries, though he certainly experienced his share of them in the early period of the war. The great soldier who could never harden himself to endure the sight of suffering and misery which follow a battle, evidently wrote at the close of his life "with malice towards none and with charity for all."

It is but just to note the absolute absence of any reference to religion. The only two allusions to such a subject are first, when noting the severe criticisms of the press he makes the confession of having a "superstition that in positions of great responsibility every one should do his duty to the best of his ability where assigned by competent authority." This superstition constrained him to remain at his post rather than by any act of his own be relieved of his responsibility and spared the harrowing complaints against his incompetency by nearly the whole country. A very rational and noble superstition! The other is the observation that "providence had directed the course of the campaign" against Vicksburg.

PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION, PHILADELPHIA.

*A Commentary on the Confession of Faith.* With questions for Theological Students and Bible classes. By the Rev. Archibald Alexander Hodge, D. D., Professor of Didactic and Polemical Theology in the

Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, at Princeton, N. J. With appendix. pp. 559.

The learned Princeton theologian presents in this work an analysis of the chapters and sections of the Westminster Confession with proofs and illustrations of its doctrines. It is a capital hand-book for Presbyterians and it prompts in a Lutheran examining it, a devout desire for a similar volume on Lutheran theology. Could not the Holman Lectures, the first series of which will be completed in June, be reduced in length and revised so as to appear in a form like this and serve the same purpose to Lutherans? Surely we do not care less for our faith than do the Presbyterians for theirs. It is, indeed, objected that literature of this character makes dry reading, but bread also as a rule is dry and ought to be, yet we give it to our children in preference to confections. Dr. Hodge's Calvinism is known to be the genuine unadulterated article and there is no mincing of it or evasion of direct statement in these pages. His exhibitions of Calvinistic doctrine are, however, not controversial in tone and no intelligent Lutheran can fail to derive great profit from his candid, luminous and strong statements.

As Dr. Krauth remarked in his review of the elder Hodge's theology: "There are but two developed systems in the world that claim with any show of probability to pe purely Biblical. These systems are the Lutheran and the Calvinistic * * and they have vast interests, great stakes, mighty bonds of sympathy in common. No two bodies of Christians have more reason for thoroughly understanding each other than Calvinists and Lutherans have, and no two parts of Christendom are closer together in some vital respects than consistent Calvinism and consistent Lutheranism. It is well worth their while to compare views." And it may be added, the Lutheran has nothing to fear from such comparison. As for instance, let any one turn, from the profound and most reverent appreciations of the awful and unique realities of the Eucharist as set forth in the Lutheran Symbols, to the amazing confession made by both Dr. Hodge and his father "that believers do in the same sense recieve and feed upon the body and blood of Christ at other times without the use of the sacrament, and in the use of other means of grace —as prayer, meditation on the word, etc." Is this either scriptural or logical? Is it Calvinistic?

HARPER AND BROTHERS, FRANKLIN SQUARE, NEW YORK.

*A Larger History of the United States of America* to the close of President Jackson's administration by Thomas Wentworth Higginson, author of "Young Folks' History of the United States." Illustrated by Maps, Plans, Portraits and other Engravings. pp. 470. 1886.

It is exceedingly gratifying to find a pen so chaste and graphic as that of Col. Higginson's applied to a subject so important and so picturesque as that of his country's history. The result is a most attractive volume,

which is chargeable only with two faults, first, that one can not bear to lay it down before reaching the last pages while yet it is too long to be read at one sitting; and secondly, that it stops with the close of Jackson's administration, without the promise of another volume to bring the annals down to the present time. The work is too charming to end with half the story untold. It is in some sense a sequel to the "Young Folks' History of the United States," though on a much larger scale, and is adapted to readers of advanced culture.

The most recent hypotheses concerning the origin and the institutions of the aborigines are canvassed with such discrimination, that the reader must accept the author's interrogation mark as still indicating the inconclusive stage of the problem. In the sketch of "Old Hickory" the author's skill in personal portraiture appears at its best. The grand old hero stands out as the impersonation of American character and politics at that epoch.

The work is excuted in bold and bright print—and enriched with a large number of illustrations sufficient alone to represent faithfully the history of the country, while the series of portraits of statesmen is probably the finest yet seen in America.

*The Great Poets as Religious Teachers.* By John H. Morrison. pp. 200. 1886.

The great poets according to the author are Dante, Shakspere and Goethe. That the two former have exerted great influence as religious teachers is generally recognized, but it is not often that Goethe finds himself in this category. Yet no really great poet could portray a complete and perfected manhood without recognizing religion as its deepest and highest attribute. Skeptic and worldling as he was, his immortal poem of "Faust," in its ideal conceptions, following the leadings of an unfettered imagination, brings out the elementary Christian truths which he might have learned as a child from his mother's lips. The little volume is a vigorous protest against the materialistic tendencies of our age and our literature and is written in a fresh and chaste style.

*The Boy Travelers in South America.* Adventures of two youths in a Journey through Equador, Peru, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay, Argentine Republic, and Chili with descriptions of Patagonia and Tierra Del Fuego, and voyages upon the Amazon and La Plata rivers. By Thomas W. Knox author of "The Young Nimrods in North America," "The Boy Travelers in the Far East," "The Voyage of the Vivien," etc., etc. Illustrated. 8vo., pp. 510. 1886.

Mr. Knox manages by means of his imaginary boy travelers, their sprightly conversations and the copious illustrations which adorn almost every page, to make all his books very attractive, entertaining and instructive to the young. His frequent contributions to their pleasure

and improvement are fast making him in their affections a formidable rival of the fabulous St. Nicholas.

In the present volume Frank and Fred traverse the length and breadth of the South American continent. Twice they cross the Andes; they descend the Madeira and the Amazon rivers; navigate the La Plata and the Paraguay; visit the principal cities of the continent, and study the manners and customs of the many people whom they encounter.

The author has made liberal appropriations from Humboldt and other famous travelers and has brought together vast stores of information on the geography, history, government, climate and social conditions of South America, with fascinating accounts about monkeys, anacondas, condors, jaguars, humming-birds, volcanoes, earthquakes, runs, aboriginal relics, &c., &c. Happy the lads who get hold of literature so healthy and withal so instructive as this very beautiful and solid volume.

*Pepper and Salt*, or Seasoning for young folk prepared by Howard Pyle. Large Quarto. pp. 120. 1886.

A most charming combination of sense and nonsense. The author designed the work ostensibly for the young folks, but the quaintness and the humor which abound in its verses and stories and pictures will make a very palatable sauce for all who have a faculty for merriment. The author excels not only in poetic merit, but he has the rare gift of story-telling and his drawings reveal the genuine artist. As a volume very curious to the eye and adapted to make men wise and to make them laugh this work is to be heartily commended.

*Ben-Hur*. A Tale of the Christ. By Lew Wallace, Author of "The Fair God." pp. 552.

Most of our readers may deem a notice of this wonderful book somewhat laggard. Although it is not so very long since it first appeared its phenomenal success has already made the literary world familiar with its character. On acquainting ourselves with its contents we feel heartily rejoiced that the demand for it has been so remarkable. A public that goes into raptures over such a tale of the Christ is pretty thoroughly Christianized, and it must be confessed that the fondness of the young for fiction can not be ascribed solely to the overwrought passions and the underdone morality of the popular novel. With dramatic elements of the first quality "Ben-Hur" unites sentiments of Christian faith and touching scenes drawn from the life of the God-man, which make it a most desirable work for the home and Sunday School. No one can find it a dull book, and no exception can be taken to the humanifying of the Redeemer, who was in the world as we are in the world. It will not hurt our faith or theology to come nearer to the human side of our Saviour.

It has lately come to light that this popular romance is due to the author's study of the evidences of Christianity to which he was moved by Ingersoll's efforts to persuade him that Christianity was not true.

*Roman History of Christian Doctrine*, by Henry C. Sheldon, Professor of Historical Theology in Boston University is necessarily deferred to our next issue.

ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & CO., NEW YORK.

*Evenings With the Sacred Poets.* A Series of Quiet Talks about the Singers and their Songs. By Frederick Saunders, Author of "Salad for the Solitary and the Social," "Pastime Papers," etc. Revised and Enlarged. pp. 574.

This work has not only been revised throughout, but enlarged by the addition of two new chapters, continuing the work to the present time. These chapters comprise many poetic gems from our modern sacred Anthology, including some recent fugitive poems of grace and beauty.

The scope of the work is widespread and comprehensive, and presents in a succinct form the essence of much that is most interesting, in anecdote and historic illustration, referring to the sacred poetry and hymnology of the Christian ages.

The volume contains not only the classic gems of devotional poetry representing all periods of the Christian Church, but also appropriate comments and illustrations of striking passages, and extensive historical notices of the authors and of the times which brought forth some of the most famous hymns. In the latter sphere the author is not so successful as in the former. He is probably a better poet than historian. How much of truth, for instance, is contained in the statements that the Ancient Church in Bohemia was called the "United Brethren;" that it dates back to the eighth century; that in the eleventh century it separated from the Romish Church after which it suffered a series of bitter persecutions in one of which John Huss was burnt; that they formed a settlement on the estate of Count Zinzendorf? The entire Evening on the German Reformation Period is the most complete historical jungle that we have ever tried to get through. The reviewer must confess his inability to find any order or sequence of facts, any unity or aim of thought in the forty pages devoted to that period. Although the following Evening is labelled the Thirty Years' War, Joachim Neander who died A. D. 1680 is included in the Reformation Era, and so is even his illustrious namesake, the Church historian, who died in 1850. Several pages are occupied by the latter "although not strictly in the category of German hymnists"—we should think not—"yet he was Luther-like a second Reformer." We suggest a revision of the historical parts of the work while expressing admiration over its choice poetic selections.

AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS, BOSTON.

*Mission Stories of Many Lands.* A Book for Young People. With Three Hundred and Forty Illustrations. 8vo. pp. 392. 1885.

This *is* a book for young people, one that can be commended without

qualification to every Christian household and to every Sunday-school, a book that is sure to interest all and to enlist the minds and hearts of young and old in the cause of Foreign Missions. So large and live a body as that represented by the A. B. C. F. M. cannot fail to collect an abundance of material for such work from its own fields and through its Missionaries. There is, therefore, no fiction about these stories—but much of that kind of truth which is stranger than fiction, and which is here put in so entertaining and lively a form, and so interspersed with illustrations and anecdotes from real life in Africa, Turkey, India, China, Japan and other lands that the volume becomes both more attractive and more instructive than many books of travel. It is another of the many monuments of the incalcuable debt which Science and Commerce owe to the enterprise, self-denial and culture of Christian Missionaries.

A. S. BARNES & CO., NEW YORK AND CHICAGO.

*Carmina Sanctorum; or Hymns and Songs of Praise, Ancient and Modern.* By Roswell D. Hitchcock, Zachary Eddy and Lewis W. Mudge. 776 hymns, with tunes. Square 8vo.

One of the most attractive and complete selections of Church hymns and tunes that has yet appeared. The spirit of praise pervades the entire work and its excellencies are those which will endure. We would have welcomed a few more airs that have become popular through evangelistic meetings, but we defer to the judgment of experienced pastors and scholars who have edited the collection and who know the difference between ephemeral and abiding merit. "Ein Feste Burg" is given twice, once with Luther's tune and once as an adaptation to the hymn

"Come, Holy Ghost, our Souls inspire."

We commend the distinguished editors for using Christian terminology and giving "THE LORD'S DAY" as the appropriate title for thirty-eight of the sweetest hymns ever gathered between the lids of a volume. The publishers are entitled to great praise for the use of large type. Church light, whether the service be by day or by night, is usually poor enough, yet few books are published in as small print as the manuals of devotion used in the sanctuary. The present work forms a rare exception. The same collection of hymns without the music, neatly executed and of ordinary pocket size, is also published by the same house at a cost of 75 cents. The larger work sells at the remarkably low figure of $1.25. Thus both the quality and the price are a model.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

*Ten Great Religions.* An Essay in Comparative Theology. By James Freeman Clarke. Twenty-second Edition. pp. 528. 1886.

*Ten Great Religions.* Part II. A Comparison of all Religions. By James Freeman Clarke. Fifth Edition. pp. 412. 1886.

The "Ten Great Religions" whose distinctive features are here outlined with charming clearness and with a wide sympathy for truth wherever found, are treated under the following titles: Confucius and the Chinese, Brahminism, Buddhism, Zoroaster and the Zend Avesta, The Gods of Egypt, The Gods of Greece, The Religion of Rome, The Teutonic and Scandinavian Religion, The Jewish Religion, Mohammed and Islam. The last chapter institutes a comparison between these religious systems and Christianity.

Granted that such a compendium of the principal religions of the world can be found nowhere else in so brief a compass and that to this is due in part the success of this work, yet the fact that twenty-two editions of a volume treating such a subject are called for in a few years must be accepted as an unmistakable tribute to American intelligence. Publishers of the most solid literature are sure to find a market when their authors possess the learning, elegance and vivacity of Mr. Clarke.

The second volume, while occupied with the same general subject, pursues a different plan. Instead of describing and discussing each of the great faiths of mankind separately, it shows what they all teach on the different points of human belief. Among the questions answered are what each declares concerning God, the Soul, the Future Life, Sin and Salvation, Human Duty, Prayer and Worship, Inspiration and Art, What is the Idea of God in all religions, how did it begin and in what way was it developed?

To any one interested in the study of spiritual ideas, the tracing of these doctrines through all the principal religions of mankind opens a most inviting and important pursuit. The value of comparative theology in the understanding and appreciation of any article of faith cannot be overestimated. For "He who only knows one religion can no more understand *that* religion than he who only knows one language can understand *that* language."

It is refreshing, too, to find in a recognized Liberal like Freeman Clarke the reverent tone towards Christianity and the sublime confidence in its progress and triumph which mark this latter volume. He has no sympathy with those who make a great noise over the decay of religious interest. He tells them to consult the census of the United States and not to form their inductions from a Sunday's observation in Chicago or Boston. While holding that Christianity does not differ from other religions in being alone true while they are false, he maintains its superiority to arise from its possessing the whole of which they possess the parts. It is the pleroma. And "all men will come to Jesus, because they find in him the mightiest influence to lift up their aspirations to his Father and their own; the fullest revelation of pardon, peace, hope, immortal life, needed by us all for the perfect development of our being."

*Progressive Orthodoxy.* A Contribution to the Christian Interpretation of Christian Doctrines. By the Editors of "The Andover Review." Professors in Andover Theological Seminary. pp. 258. 1886.

The series of papers which appear in this little volume treat of such subjects as The Incarnation, The Atonement, Eschatology, The Work of the Holy Spirit, Christianity and Missions, The Scriptures.

A strong hand is recognized in each of these discussions. The Andover men represent ability and force as well as reverence and intense earnestness. Their power resides in these qualities more than in their so-called progressiveness or any "new" features of their theology.

Not everything is progress that comes along under that name. And it is surprising that views on Eschatology and other subjects which have characterized German theology for more than half a century should be accepted and put forth at Andover as new theology. Could such teachings even be recognized as new, their claim of progress on the line of the old must stagger many minds. Much of what is here maintained is by implication or directly a departure from the old to an extent that renders the one incompatible with the other. For instance, not only did Jesus Christ come into the world to save sinners, but he evidently produced in his Apostles the conviction that the work of salvation was to be completed in this world. They engaged in their calling with a zeal and gave expression to views which can only be explained by their belief that men were to be saved here and now if ever.

It may be true as is claimed that the views for which these essays contend so vigorously are the views of a large and highly influential part of the clergy of the Congregational Churches of America, but an air of exaggeration is revealed when it is boldly stated that the doctrine which limits probation to this life is "fast disappearing from all branches of the Christian Church." With all the aggressiveness and self-confidence of the "new theology" it is hardly yet entitled to the boast of sweeping everything before it. It may not be untimely or unfriendly to counsel modesty to its leaders—for though some of their views may pass for a "new theology," it is quite certain that others will not remain as the final theology. There is as yet in this movement too much of a destructive tendency and not enough of a constructive character to warrant the conclusion that any definite or durable results have thus far been yielded by it.

*The First Napoleon.* A Sketch, Political and Military. By John Codman Ropes, Member of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Author of "The Army under Pope," etc. pp. 347. 1886.

We have had of late years so much of the baser side of Napoleon's character that it is quite agreeable to have once more a glance at the

other side. The recoil from those revolting exhibitions is very natural, and this may in part account for the roseate hues in which Mr. Ropes has painted the greatest military and political prodigy of modern times.

There are also other grounds for an American writer springing to the defense of this European butcher. When one sees how far the French even at this day are from having the essential attributes of free government he cannot take issue with the author's view that the *coup d'état* of the 18th of Brumaire did not destroy the liberties of the French. What Napoleon overthrew was not the Republic but an irresponsible and despotic oligarchy. Her true liberties, whatever may have been the nominal form of her government, France received soon after from the Consul himself in the permanent embodiment of the Code Napoleon. Napoleon's career of foreign invasion, it must be confessed, had also its brighter phases. Certainly in Southern Europe the advent of the French armies was hailed with sincere joy by the better classes, as bringing deliverance from an intolerable state of things. The French were at least recognized as contending for progress, for civil liberty and for enlightenment, while their opponents, the monarchs, the priests and the lazzaroni were fighting for the absolutism and superstition of the old *regime*. "At the bottom of the twenty years' strife was the irrepressible conflict between liberty and equality on the one hand, and privilege and despotism on the other."

Mr. Ropes also reminds us of an important fact that should never be overlooked in our review of Napoleon's career, namely, that the reactionary party finally overwhelmed him and that in the nature of things the successful party magnify and aggravate the doings of those whom they have crushed so as to distort the truth of history. But however we may accord with or differ from Mr. Ropes' estimate of his hero, none can fail to appreciate the vigor, freshness and fascination with which he has treated an old and well-worn subject. He measures up to the grandeur of his theme not only in the delineations of his personal character and of his political plans and purposes, but notably in the description of his military campaigns, his marches and battles. Mr. Ropes is in the front rank of military historians.

*Verses.* Translations from the German, and Hymns. By W. H. Furness. pp. 88. 1886.

This tasteful little volume in parchment attracts alike by its appearance and its contents. It pleases the eye and refreshes the mind. The translations are of poems, longer or shorter, of acknowledged place and rank in literature. The longest pieces are Schiller's "Song of the Bell," and Chamisso's "Woman's Love and Life" and "Steam-Steed." Then we have Gerok's "Children's Worship" and Heine's "Two Grenadiers" and "Lorelei." Eleven of Uhland's beautiful ballads follow,

and Oehlenschlager's "To Columbus Dying." The first of Mr. Furness' own pieces is his "Song" about John Brown. This and the hymns which follow, twenty of them, well sustain the excellence of the preceding selections. Quite a number of these have high poetic quality, and are specially marked by their depth and tenderness of religious sentiment.

GINN & CO., BOSTON.

*Outlines of Psychology.* Dictated Portions of the Lectures of Hermann Lotze. Translated and Edited by George T. Ladd, Professor of Philosophy in Yale College. pp. 153. 1886.

The service undertaken by Prof. Ladd of bringing out in English the series of Hermann Lotze's *Dictates* is the more appreciated as the successive volumes appear. Perhaps the surpassing excellence of the present volume is due somewhat to its special subject, being one for the handling of which Lotze's talent, training and practice peculiarly fitted him. At any rate the compend of psychology given in this outline will be found one of the most suggestive and valuable in the entire literature of the subject.

The author divides the subject into two parts, the first treating of The Single Elements of the inner Life, and the second of Theoretical Psychology. The examination, recognizing the physical facts and conditions, notices first the external impressions by which the spiritual activity is awakened and kept up, then the various internal elaboration of these impressions, and passes thence to a consideration of some of the great psychological questions, as to the Soul, the Reciprocal action between Soul and Body, the Seat of the Soul, the Soul's Essence, its Changeable States, and the Realm of Souls. All through the reader will find the outline marked by the keen and subtle analysis and rich suggestiveness of the true philosopher. Whatever opinions we may hold on some of the points of this explanation we cannot but feel the quickening force everywhere moving through the discussion.

*The Leading Facts of English History.* By D. H. Montgomery. pp. xxxiv., 254. 1886.

This bright little volume presents briefly, but clearly and comprehensively, the broad, vital facts of English history in their connection with the great laws of national growth. While dealing only with the salient points of his wide theme, the author has made a lively and readable book, and in his rapid sketch one may see with absorbing interest the stirring movements and steady progress of which that little Island has been the theatre.

It is well adapted as a text-book for scholars and is incomparable as a handy reference book, containing as it does besides the "Leading Facts" in narrative form, also a table showing the Descent of the English Sovereigns, a tabulated summary of the principal events of English History,

an Outline of the Constitutional and Political History of England, Acts of Parliament, etc., Statistics and full Indices.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

*Hobbes.* By George Croom Robertson, Grote Professor of Philosophy of Mind and Logic in University College, London. pp. 240. 1886.

This is one of the series of "Philosophical Classics for English Readers," edited by William Knight, LL. D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of St. Andrews. The entire series has proved to be of high merit, and this volume on Hobbes does not fall behind the best. No one could have been found more happily qualified than Prof. Robertson to prepare it, and give us a fair and appreciative view of Hobbes' career and philosophy. The aim has been to bring together all the previously known or now discoverable facts of his life and to give a balanced representation of his whole range of thought. To an unusual degree the system of thought, if system it may be called, which Hobbes left to the world was the product of personal circumstances and of the events of his times, and can be understood and estimated only in the light of such biographical and historical sketch as is here given. The volume is heartily recommended.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & CO., NEW YORK.

*Religion in a College:* What Place it shall have. Being an Examination of President Eliot's Paper, read before the Nineteenth Century Club, in New York, Feb. 3, 1886. By James McCosh, D. D., LL. D., D. Lit., Author of "The Method of Divine Government," "The Emotions," etc. pp. 22. 1886.

The smallnes of this pamphlet is no measure of the importance of the great subject or of the high value of the discussion. Dr. McCosh deserves the thanks of all lovers of their country and human welfare for his strong and triumphant showing of the need of religious instruction in our colleges. This pamphlet should be circulated everywhere.

*Expository Sermons and Outlines on the Old Testament.* pp. 308. 1886.

This is the first of a series of volumes, called "The Clerical Library," for the clergy and students of all denominations. The series is meant to furnish stimulus and suggestion in the various departments of ministerial work. The sermons are drawn from leading men in the different denominations, and are practical rather than controversial.

These expositions are all gathered from fugitive or unpublished sources. There are thirty-six of them—mostly by Anglican clergymen of eminent fame, as Archdeacon Farrar, Canon Liddon, Dean Vaughan, Bishop Alexander, Dean Bradley, Canon Knox-Little, Dean Perowne, Dr. Maclaren, Dr. Mattheson, Bishop Stubbs, Prof. Davidson, Dr. Parker, etc. Some of the discourses are lengthy and others brief, and they are prevailingly marked by the scholarly depth and thorough-

ness to be expected of men whose ability has won the prominence which these enjoy. They abound in quickening and fruitful thought. Some of them are models of expository practical discussion.

In view of the substantial excellence of the book, it is to be regretted that the editor, whoever he is, did not add to the convenience of its use by placing the names of the writers at the head of the discourses, and especially by a table of contents and a full analytic index of both the general and particular subjects presented. These additions would greatly enhance the value of the volume.

*A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians.* By Thomas Charles Edwards, M. A., of Lincoln College, Oxford. Principal of the University College of Wales. Second Edition. pp. 491. 1886.

To the question, why still another commentary, the best answer is: study the volume and you will see, for you will find it a real help and an excellent guide in the study of this important epistle, which has not suffered from too many commentaries. The work was evidently written with a devout and spiritual interest in the teachings of the apostle, and while there is evidence of ample learning, discriminating judgment and exegetical cleverness, it is less mechanical and much fresher and more stimulating than the average commentary. One finds pleasure in using it, apart from merely consulting it on any given passage.

There is but little indication of dogmatical bias, although an expositor possessing the general merits of our author must have been swayed by other influences than the plain meaning of the text, when he explains the sin of those who do not discern the Lord's body in the sacrament as consisting in their failure to recognize the difference between the Eucharistic and any social meal! Some degree of guessing appears to be indispensable to the exegete. The author concludes that the appearance of the risen Lord to about five hundred brethren at once must have occurred after the day of Pentecost, the genuine disciples not having numbered previously more than a hundred and twenty. It is nowhere stated that this was the limit of the number, and when it is remembered what width of meaning is given to the term "disciples" and that our Lord had made an appointment for a meeting with his disciples in Galilee after his resurrection, the presence of five hundred is not at all surprising. More than ten times that multitude had often followed him before his death.

Mr. Edwards disavows the adoption of any theory bearing on the doctrine of two resurrections and pleads ignorance of Millenarian literature, but he finds the text in 15 : 23–26 too strong to admit of anything but this doctrine. Like many others he has apparently overlooked the distinction between *ανάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν* and *ανάστασις εκ νεκρῶν*, which being uniformly maintained puts any other doctrine out of the question.

*The New Princeton Review.* From the same house we have received the first two issues of the "The New Princeton Review," a periodical which revives an honored name and whose predecessors maintained the distinction of being chief among the Reviews. An examination of the contents of the numbers which have appeared and of the list of contributors makes one conclude that the new is better than the old. In reality the connection with the old goes no farther than the name, the "New Princeton" being not a revival of the old Review, but an entirely new enterprise, a new departure in the field of higher periodical literature. It aims at presenting a wide range of topics embracing political, social, philosophical, literary, religious and art questions, and proposes to discuss them in a "catholic spirit of scholarship," bringing the best writers into contact with the best readers on all topics of scholarship and general interest. Among the most attractive features is the editorial summary of the latest results of investigation and work, here and abroad, in the various fields of science. The contents for January are, "Society in the New South," Charles Dudley Warner; "What an American Philosophy should be," James McCosh; "The Christian Conception of Property," C. H. Parkhurst; "Lunar Problems now under Debate," C. A. Young; "The Political Situation;" "A Free Press in the Middle Colonies," John Bach McMaster; "Monsieur Motte."

Among the contributors for March are James Russel Lowell, Francis L. Patton, George Dana Boardman and H. H. Boyesen.

The "*New Princeton*" will be published six times a year at the moderate figure of $3.00 in advance. If no real demand has existed for a periodical of the wide scope and high character of this, we predict that it will soon create one. We are glad to learn that it has already gained extraordinary success.

THOMAS WHITTAKER, NEW YORK.
For Sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

*Authorship of the Four Gospels.* External Evidences. By William Marwin, Ex-Judge of the District Court of the United States, for the Southern District of Florida, and author of "A Treatise on the Law of Wreck and Salvage." pp. 142. 1886.

Judge Marvin has written this small book not for scholars who have access to learned authorities, but for the people, and a most admirable thing has he made of it. It presents the well-established historical evidences for the genuineness and authenticity of the Gospels, from the quotations and testimonies of the early Christian Fathers, the witness of Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny, &c., using the results of the latest investigations of scholars in connection with recently discovered manuscripts. The special excellence of the book is found in the clear and impressive arrangement of the recognized proofs, the calm, candid, judicial, straight-forward treatment of the whole matter. The atten-

tion of the reader is not confused by unnecessary details, but is held steadily to the essential points. This adapts the book to the service of general readers, putting them in possession of the vital and decisive facts in the case. The volume deserves a wide circulation.

F. H. REVEL, CHICAGO.

*Current Discussions in Theology.* By the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary, vol. 3. pp. 359. 1885.

The student of Theological and Ecclesiastical subjects has here an annual handbook giving him an intelligent survey of the different fields of sacred learning and of the principal fruits gathered from them during the previous twelve months. It is the only work of the kind in our language and is invaluable to all who would keep abreast with the age in theological science, but whose time and means render it impospossible to do this at first hand.

Of course the readers must be assured of the thoroughness, ability and fairness of the different writers on whose reviews of current discussions they are willing to depend for instruction, but a careful examination of one of these Annuals produces confidence in their possession of these requisites. Yet this tribute must be qualified. As Wangemann's recent work on the Lutheran Church created such a ferment among conservative theologians and called forth scores of replies in Germany, it would seem to have been the fair thing to have presented here the gist of some of these replies, instead of pointing simply to the confirmation which Wangemann's "researches" give to the views on conservative Lutherans expressed in these *discussions* last year. Let us by all means have both sides, especially when "unchristian and unlutheran sacramentarian exclusiveness" is charged by one party. Instead of calling this the "current *discussions*," touching "The Modern German Church," a more appropriate label would be "Current *attacks* on the Conservative Lutheran Party in the German Church." It is extremely gratifying to find one of the editors appreciating Prof. Frank, of Erlangen, a leading representative of these "unchristian" Lutherans, whose first volume on Christian Ethics is reviewed at considerable length and whose treatise on Christian Certitude is admitted to be an epoch-making book. It is saying a great deal in praise of an American theologian when he can be credited with understanding, translating and appreciating a German scholar of the caliber of Dr. Fr. H. R. Frank.

These Current Discussions will appear hereafter annually in October.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

*Mechanics and Faith.* A Study of Spiritual Truth in Nature. By Charles Talbot Porter. pp. 295. 1886.

Mr. Porter feels that, at first view, his subject may seem to most persons to express opposite extremes of thought; but this is owing, he

thinks, not to any variance or antagonism between mechanics and faith, but to our "conventional habits of thought" formed by false education. Instead of antagonism there is harmony. More than that: mechanical science aids directly in establishing the solid foundation of faith (p. 4). In showing this he does not accept the definition of matter as given by scientists. Instead of being distinct from force, it is "force itself manifested in endless diversity of adaptation to our nature and wants." Mechanical science, while dealing with matter, is not itself material but spiritual, in its nature and influence. It is, therefore, opposed to materialism and thus indirectly an aid to faith.

He not only gives a definition of matter at variance with that of physicists, but his definition of faith would not be accepted by the theologian as comprehensive enough. "It is that state of trust, peace, and repose of the soul in God, which is not capable of being disturbed." It is "a state or condition of the mind, rather than a form of spiritual activity" (p. 271). In the last chapter, prayer is represented as only subjective in its influence, and the objects of prayer virtually limited to one thing. Force, Truth, Beauty, and Love are "the four spiritual realities, which, in their unity, interpenetrate, if indeed they do not constitute, all material forms of being." On this basis, and with matter and faith as here defined, Mr. Porter shows harmony to exist everywhere. Whatever may be the judgment as to his views, his originality of thought and ingenuity of treatment must be conceded.

*The Story of the Jews.* By James K. Hosmer, Professor in Washington University, St. Louis. pp. 381. 1886.

*The Story of Chaldea*, from the Earliest Times to the Rise of Assyria (treated as a general Introduction to the study of Ancient History). By Z. A. Ragozin, of Paris. pp. 381. 1886.

These are the third and fourth volumes of "The Story of Nations" series in course of publication by the enterprising Putnams. They are intended for young readers, and the style and treatment are adapted, as far as possible, to that class.

With rapid sketches Prof. Hosmer carries the reader through Jewish history to the time of Christ in less than 100 pages. To the Bible-reader this is familiar ground. It is the experience of the Jews among the different nations, since the second century of the Christian era, that occupies most of the space and will prove of special interest.

In a more spirited style Ragozin relates the story of Chaldea, to which fresh interest is given by the excavations at Nineveh by Layard and others. All the light that the most recent discoveries give is used here, and the result is a book of most fascinating interest. Both these volumes are profusely illustrated and attractively bound.

TICKNOR & COMPANY, BOSTON.

*The Life and Genius of Gœthe.* Lectures at the Concord School of Philosophy. Edited by F. B. Sanborn. pp. 454. 1886.

These lectures were delivered in the Summer of 1885, at the seventh session of the Concord School of Philosophy. Of the nineteen then delivered thirteen are published in this volume. The subjects in their order are, "Gœthe's Youth;" "Gœthe's Self-Culture;" "Gœthe's Titanism;" "Gœthe and Schiller;" "Gœthe's Märchen;" "Gœthe's Relation to English Literature;" "Gœthe as a Playwright;" "Das Ewig-Weibliche;" "The Elective Affinities;" "Child Life as Portrayed by Gœthe;" "History of the Faust Poem;" "Gœthe's Women;" "Gœthe's Faust."

All these lectures are highly laudatory of the great German poet—none more so than that of Dr. Bartol, in his comparison of Gœthe and Schiller. Even his gross immoralities, instead of being frankly acknowledged as blots on his character, are excused, explained away, or glossed over. We are not surprised at the laudations of Gœthe's genius, for he is the acknowledged prince of German poets, but his moral lapses should not escape condemnation. The admirers of this highly gifted and accomplished man will be delighted with these lectures. Among the most interesting are Mrs. Sherman's "Child Life as Portrayed by Gœthe," and Mrs. Howe's "Gœthe's Women." Not the least valuable features of the book are the copious index and the bibliography of Gœthe's works and works on Gœthe. Two portraits are given, one of Gœthe in youth and the other of Gœthe in age, from Rauch's bust.

*Every-Day Religion.* By James Freeman Clarke, author of "Self-Culture," etc. pp. 464. 1886.

This book is well named. It is full of practical moral lessons for every-day life. The papers it contains are not sermons, though some of them begin with Scripture texts, but addresses on religious duty in many of its practical aspects. Their influence cannot be otherwise than healthful and helpful to a high grade of moral life. There is not much said in favor of church life, creeds, religious worship, or orthodoxy, for the author is a shining light in a school of thinkers not in sympathy with such things, but he is always reverent and often speaks like an ardent believer in the divine-human Saviour. He preaches morality, but it is a morality pervaded by such a Christlike spirit that it is akin to genuine religious life. The papers are moral essays but moral essays of such a high type that much of what he says could come with the greatest propriety from the most orthodox Christian pulpit.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

*The Complete Commentary on the New Testament.* Edited by Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D. Commentary on John. pp. 423.

Such a commentary as this should meet with a welcome at any time,

but especially now, when so many in the Church of Christ are studying the Gospel of the Beloved Disciple. The international Sunday-school lessons, from April 1 to Nov. 21st, are taken from it.

The comments are clear, scholarly, and yet withal very practical. They are proportionate in length too, to the difficulty of the different passages. What requires little explanation is treated briefly, but what is obscure or disputed is given all the fulness of treatment that the subject demands. This is noticeable throughout the commentary, but we were specially struck with it in examining the sixth and sixteenth chapters. Everywhere, however, the notes are discriminating, suggestive, and full enough.

The introduction is a paper of special merit. Here in about fifty solid pages we have a lucid and learned discussion of (1) the authorship of the Gospel according to John; (2) its trustworthiness as a historical record, especially as a record of the discourses of Jesus; (3) the time and place of its composition; and (4) the occasion, object, and plan of it. This introduction alone is worth more than the price of the whole work.

COLEGROVE BOOK COMPANY, CHICAGO.

*The Morals of Christ.* A Comparison with Contemporaneous Systems. By Austin Bierbower, author of "Principles of a System of Philosophy." etc. pp. 200. Paper cover.

The contemporaneous systems of morals, with which Mr. Bierbower compares that taught by Christ, are the Mosaic, the Pharisaic, and the Græco-Roman. That of Christ is shown to be so superior to each one and all of the others that the comparison grows into a contrast. If there is any criticism we would offer, it is that some of the author's inferences are rather extreme. We were impressed with this on p. 86 as to forms in worship, and on p. 140 as to "something of socialistic instinct" in Christ. The work deserves a better cover.

W. A. WILDE & CO., 25 BROMFIELD ST., BOSTON.

*Select Notes.* A Commentary on the International Lessons for 1886. By Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D. D., and M. A. Peloubet. pp. 330.

With these notes in hand the Sunday-school teacher is well provided for studying the international lessons. On each lesson there are usually introductory remarks, explanatory notes, library references, practical lessons, and suggestions to teachers. These are so full, and in general so satisfactory, that there is little else to be desired. The commentary also has pictorial illustrations, maps and chronological charts that are quite helpful. We know of nothing more convenient for the Sunday-school teacher.

PAMPHLETS.

*The Relation of Children to the Church.* By Rev. M. G. Boyer. Read before the Northeast Conference of the Allegheny Synod, and published by request of Conference. Sensible, practical, scriptural.

*An Address* delivered before the Northumberland County Directors' Association, at Sunbury, Pa., March 5th, 1885. By Rev. W. H. Gotwald, M. A. Timely, readable and sensible.

CORRECTIONS.

1. Prof. Waffle's excellent work on *The Lord's Day*, in the January issue, was not credited, as it should have been, to the AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, PHILADELPHIA. We take this first opportunity of making the correction. The S. S. Union published the work at great expense, and should have due credit.

2. In the Prospectus of the Harper Periodicals the combination offer should have been *omitted.* See third page of cover for Prospectus as corrected. These periodicals--*Magazine*, *Weekly*, *Bazar* and *Young People*—all of them, more than maintain their excellent rank.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

We will deem it a special favor if our subscribers remit their dues as promptly as possible. Statements of indebtedness have recently been sent. Let them be met by an early response.

THE

# QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JULY, 1886.

## ARTICLE I.

### THE RELATION OF SCIENCE TO RELIGION.

By REV. J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, D. D., Berlin.

In the discussion of this subject the attention is usually confined to the results of scientific investigation in order to determine their effect on religion. Valuable as this method is it does not go to the root of the matter, for it always leaves in doubt the effect that may be produced by future discoveries. How far *can* science affect religion? is a deeper, broader, and more important question than this: How far *have* the discoveries of science affected religion? In order that the former may be answered it will be necessary to inquire into the relation of science itself to religion.

Whenever there has been a revival of learning, or marked progress in any department of thought, or a popularization of the results of scholarship, the tendency has at first been to produce confusion. Cherished convictions and the established order of things were threatened by the innovations. This is illustrated by the humanists in Italy, the reformation in Germany, the discoveries of Copernicus and Galileo, the various efforts of the last century to popularize the results of criticism, and of those in our age to popularize science. When an arcanum of the schools is made the property of the masses it usually produces agitation and disorder. The subject may be

of such a nature as to require special preparation; since the masses lack this they will misapprehend the subject, will seize some parts and neglect others, and will take, what they do appropriate, in a fragmentary and imperfect form. The less prepared they are to appreciate its depth or even to grasp its first principles, the more likely they are to imagine that they have mastered it completely. In order to make any profound theme the commodity of the people at large it is not enough to let it down to them; they must also be raised into its appreciation.

When a scholarly subject is popularized the imperfect apprehension is usually supplemented by wrong applications and incorrect inferences. A new adjustment of the old to the new views becomes necessary, and the uncritical adoption of crude notions is usually followed by the hasty rejection of cherished opinions. When the work of destruction once begins and grows into a habit there is no telling where it will end. While the revolution is absorbed in removing the rubbish of past ages it does not yet become evident what the new structure is to be. A period of more sober reflection is required to pass from a destructive to a constructive period.

In our day the rapid development of science and the efforts to make it popular simply reveal the phenomena usual on such occasions. When we speak of the spread of science we are apt to forget that the scientific spirit and method are found in very rare cases. Science itself depends on the authority of facts and mathematical demonstrations; but the opinions on scientific subjects floating about in a community are generally based on the authority of some investigator. The so-called popular science is often misleading; and it is not surprising that investigators like Professor Tait speak of it contemptuously. He calls it a "very peculiar smattering," advises his hearers to "eschew popular science, whose dicta are pernicious just in proportion as they are the outcome of presumptuous ignorance," and declares that "even among the particularly well educated class who write for the higher literary and scientific journals, there is wide-spread ignorance as to some of the most elementary principles of Physics." (*Recent Advances in Physical Science*). One need but know the worth of the ordinary opinions

on scientific subjects in order to appreciate the value of the inferences drawn from them.

The intellectual victory over error is gained less by direct attacks than by completely mastering and exposing the erroneous principles. To overcome the errors of faith and of skepticism we must understand the grounds on which they rest, particularly their psychological basis. When scientific knowledge is spread many old notions are found to be false, while others are seen to rest on insufficient data; as a consequence faith in them is shaken. When the mind after a firm but false faith begins to doubt, it is inclined to go to the other extreme, namely to universal skepticism. It is natural that with its basis faith itself should fall; but with this we do not stop. Not only do we make our convictions the basis of faith, but we also treat them as if the reality or existence of the objects of faith depended on these convictions. It is forgotten that the object itself is not in the least affected by our faith or unbelief. The faith of the Romans does not make Jupiter anything outside of the mind of the believer, any more than the denial of the whole world that the sun is the centre of our system affects its position. Reality is the only sure basis of faith; but faith can never be the creator or basis of reality. The converse is also equally true: the fact that faith is found to have rested on an insecure basis must shake that faith; but it does not prove that the object of that faith does not exist.

Whoever has been disciplined in modern philosophy, especially in the Kantian system, will not make the mistake of identifying his faith with the existence of its objects. When consequently criticism or intellectual progress removes the past foundations of faith he will see at once that this does not imply that the objects do not exist. There may be a flaw in Anselm's ontological argument, and yet God may be. The world moved before it was demonstrated or believed. The question therefore is not whether we believe or deny the existence of an object, but whether proofs can be given that it does exist; though even if this cannot be done faith may be made impossible by proving that there can be for it no reliable basis. The attacks on faith, therefore, lead the thoughtful man to a thorough revision

of its grounds and are calculated to make him, if his belief is at all shaken, an honest doubter, and to give him the strongest impulse to seek the truth. The attitude of a sincere doubter and inquirer is not only in perfect harmony with Christianity, but is actually demanded by it, until all just reason to question is removed. Professing to lead into the truth, it encourages the severest tests of its doctrines. It wants its followers to be able to give a reason for the faith in them, and to prove all things, while holding fast only to that which is good.

The Christian's attitude toward science is therefore that of a free man who has an open mind for the truth wherever found and whatever its nature—an attitude which is part of his religion and not in spite of it. Any other position would spring from a narrow dogmatism, bigotry, or fanaticism. All effort to check free and thorough investigation is evidence of weakness of faith, which lacks confidence in its basis, and fears that digging will reveal its sandy foundation. This perfect freedom of investigation of course does not mean that the hypotheses of investigators are at once to be accepted as final or that the money and institutions of the church are to be the means of spreading them. But no sane man questions that whatever is firmly established as truth, whatever its nature, will eventually prevail.

This is the true Protestant position respecting science. Whether the evangelical churches have always been true to it is another question. Sometimes utterances of ministers may breathe a different spirit; but they are as subversive of Protestant principles as of the autonomy of science. And no one who makes the truth the supreme aim of his search will for a moment hesitate to declare it a religious duty to reject religion if it is proved false.

This lays the stress where religion, science, and philosophy demand that it be placed, namely on the proof. And this leads to the inquiry how far scientific proof can affect religion.

The term science is oft used in the vaguest sense, so that in popular parlance it loses the definiteness and exactness usually claimed for it. Sometimes it stands for systematized knowledge, classified knowledge, "organized common sense," learning in

general; then again it is applied only to positive knowledge, or to that which is absolutely certain because mathematically demonstrated. Theology, ethics, logic, history, heraldry, have been called sciences; though it is evident that there is a marked difference between them and the sciences of physics and chemistry. It is unfortunate that in its supposed conflicts with religion science is so often used vaguely and yet at the same time is lauded as absolutely certain and mathematically exact. The last characteristics evidently apply only to natural science, and this is generally meant when the relation of science to religion is discussed.

In the strict sense, science deals with the facts of nature and their laws, both determined with mathematical exactness and certainty. Helmholtz says, "that what physical science strives after is the knowledge of laws, in other words, the knowledge how at different times under the same conditions the same results are brought about." The laws drawn from the facts and embracing them may be so united as to form a complete system. By the union of the laws which pertain to the same subject we get a department of science or one of the sciences, as physics, chemistry, anatomy, physiology, and the like. The more perfect a science is, the more complete will be its laws and the comprehension of all pertinent facts under them; and at the same time the laws will not merely be placed together as in a classification, but they will be so united as to form a system, each law being put in its proper relation to every other law. Not only can the laws of a particular branch (as physics) be thus systematized, but the laws of all the special sciences may be formed into one body or system of science. The work of systematizing is really a part of logic and can often be better performed by the logician than by the man who devotes himself mainly to the collection and verification of facts, and to the establishment of the laws which bind them together.

That this is the proper sphere of science in the strict sense, and that it does not transcend this, is so generally admitted by scientists that it would not need special mention were it not for the looseness in the use of terms, which arises largely from the effort to popularize science. It is not uncommon for workers in

science to denounce all *a priori* assumptions and metaphysical speculations, while they themselves lose much of their reasoning on mere assumptions and enter on the wildest speculations, and then claim for them all the absoluteness of science. One of two things: Science must either, as its votaries claim, eschew all speculation, or it must abandon the claim of being absolutely certain and mathematically exact. It is one of the most urgent intellectual needs of the day to define sharply what is meant by science, and to determine its relation to philosophy, religion, and other departments of thought, and what its limits are.

Until there is an agreement on the use of terms all discussion is simply beating the air. We must therefore examine more closely the definition of science. The view given above is just what scientists claim and what their method implies. What makes the results incontrovertible? Because they are based on facts and can be tested by an appeal to facts. Professor Tait says: "Nothing can be learned as to the physical world save by observation and experiment, or by mathematical deductions from data so obtained." These "mathematical deductions" can never give anything but quantitative relations of the facts themselves. Dealing exclusively with numbers, time, and the properties of space, they cannot teach anything respecting quality, cause, or the ultimate principles of being.

Before a law is established some hypothesis is usually adopted to account for the facts. Newton, whose method is lauded as a scientific model, used it very freely. And in the present, as in the past, scientific works teem with hypotheses. They are mere suppositions or postulates with various degrees of probability. They may be little better than a guess or they may be suggested by a limited number of facts. When the hypothesis is used to explain facts it becomes a theory. From Galileo to the present day the progress of science has depended on observation, experiment, the adoption of hypotheses and their test by making them theories to see whether they account for the facts. Some of the professed followers of Bacon have indeed proclaimed the accumulation of facts as the chief work of the scientist; but such a protest has come from the leaders that those who adopt this view are justly regarded as sustaining to the true scientist

the relation which the hod-carrier does to the mason. If there is to be progress in science there must be profound thought, close reasoning, and a judicious choice of hypotheses as well as an accumulation of facts. Our great scientists are not mere empirics.

Owing to the prominent part played by hypotheses it is important to know their exact place. They are essential as aids or means, but they are not a part of science itself. A good working hypothesis may be of great service in that it gives the investigation a definite direction, namely the determination of its truth or falsity; or it provisionally serves to unite certain facts, thus bringing them the more completely under the control of the mind. But its use is perverted as soon as it is endowed with final and absolute authority. The supposition that a substance called ether is diffused through space and that it helps to explain gravitation, (*actio in distans*,) light, heat, electricity, and other physical and chemical operations, may be of great use to the scientist. But its existence is a mere hypothesis. The physicist treats it as ponderable or imponderable, determines its mathematical properties, and in every respect endows it, not according to the results of experiment, but hypothetically, in order to get a plausible explanation of phenomena. The only way the existence of ether can be determined is either by direct discovery, or by demonstrating that nothing else can account for the facts, both of which may be impossible. A hypothesis may explain all the known facts and yet be false; for there may be other facts which it cannot explain, and there may be other suppositions which account for them equally well. Frequently there are rival hypotheses which cannot both be true but which may both be false. The hypothesis which has most probability in its favor will gain the ascendancy, and it will cease to be an hypotheses when it is found incapable of explaining the facts or else is proved to be true. Newton's demonstrations made the theory of gravitation a law.

As soon as theories are treated as an integral part of science its absoluteness is at an end, and it becomes one of the most unreliable and most variable departments of thought. The corpuscular yields to the undulatory theory of light; motion

takes the place of phlogiston; electricity is one fluid, or two fluids, or no fluid at all; the atoms are made to order by the physicist, and the chemist changes them to suit his particular purpose. As soon as scientists transcend facts and their laws, and enter the region of hypotheses and principles, their violent conflicts with one another prove that the exactness and certainty of science have been left behind. "The larger conceptions and principles of physical inquiry are so notoriously under dispute at the present day that it is almost trivial to mention the fact." (Editor of *Mind*).

It is unfortunately common in our day to attribute to speculation and hypotheses what belongs only to science. Virchow (*Ueber die Freiheit der Wissenschaft in modern Staat*) says: "I desire to warn against the continuance of the caprice of unrestrained personal speculation which now prevails in many departments of natural science. * * We must not forget that there is a limit between the speculative domain of science and what has actually been attained and perfectly established." As an illustration he says: "We cannot teach, we cannot proclaim it is an attainment of science, that man has descended from the ape or any other animal. We can only designate it as a problem, however probable it may seem." He then shows how the theory of man's descent from the brutes has been treated as if demonstrated, and what dangers would result from this theory when adopted by socialists. Coming from such a scientist these are significant warnings. He also says: "The attempt to deprive the Church of its authority and to put the Theory of Descent in place of its dogmas, this attempt, gentlemen, must prove abortive; and in its failure it will bring the greatest dangers on the position of science in general."

Questions of fact can easily be settled by observation or experiment; the scientific laws are established by the facts. Both are exact and absolute. If now there is a conflict between science and religion it must mean that religion conflicts with scientific facts and laws. If this is really the case there can be no question that science will eventually gain the victory. Faith is no longer possible after demonstration has made it impossible.

Eliminating then speculation and mere hypotheses and whatever else may lack the absolute certainty of scientific facts and laws, we here consider science only in its strict sense in speaking of its relation to religion. A supposed conflict between the two is of course possible only so far as both occupy the same ground. Science may cultivate a sphere which does not affect religion, and religion may move in a region which science does not enter; in that case there can be no contrast, much less a conflict. So far as religion deals with facts which are subject to scientific verification a conflict is possible. The mythologic religions had many such facts, putting the supernatural where natural causes have been discovered. But even the great historic religions may have elements which, whether originally taught or introduced later, are subject to scientific tests. Such are the age of the earth, the order of the appearance and development of life, how long the human family has existed, and a theory of the heavens. No religion can save the Ptolemaic theory after the Copernican system has been established; and the religion which teaches it is based either on unreliable authority or else on an incorrect interpretation of that authority.

But the facts in dispute between religion and science, whatever way they may be decided, cannot affect religion itself. They may affect views of inspiration, of interpretation, or the incidentals of this or that faith, but not the essence of religion. Every one who reflects must see that it is not the facts or laws of astronomy, or geology, or biology, or physics, or chemistry, which endanger religion, but the unproved hypotheses and the inferences which are tested by logic and not by facts.

In the laws of science the facts are formulated. They simply express what is common to all the facts included, but they add no new element to the facts. If they do, how can they be tested by facts? That the law adds a new factor or is an interpreter of facts belongs to the mythology of science. If a law contains more than the facts, how can it be drawn from them? Where does it get the plus? Helmholtz says that we have to discover the laws "in the facts." But his statement is misleading when he says: "To find the *law* by which they are regu-

lated is to *understand* phenomena." We simply reason in a circle when we make the law depend wholly on the facts and then explain the facts by the law. In the very next sentence he, however, shows that the statement does not mean what it really says: "For law is nothing more than the general conception in which a series of similarly recurring natural processes may be embraced." When we ask what the laws stand for, the answer is—Force. They teach nothing beyond this. There may be disputes respecting the nature of force or its very existence. ("There is probably no such *thing* as force at all!" Tait.) From the action of what are called forces we infer the existence and the nature of substances. They are never given directly and cannot be discovered by the senses; we can only think them.

It is thus evident that science can never teach us anything beyond the operation of force; nothing respecting matter itself, or substance, or the first or final cause. The principles which explain the origin of things, or which are the starting point for the deductions of ethics and religion, are wholly beyond its reach. Thus the questions respecting the existence and the nature of God, the being, the character, and the immortality of the soul, are altogether irrelevant to natural science.

When confined to its proper sphere, therefore, science is necessarily without God but it can never be atheistic. The most devout investigator, so far as he is scientific, does not at all consider religious questions. However familiar the moralist may be with the laws of mechanics, he is not expected to discuss them in his ethics; so the scientist, whether theist or atheist, must always leave his specialty in order to consider religious problems. When he does consider them it is not in virtue but in spite of his science. Confined to facts, their immediate causes and laws, he pursues his investigations wholly free from all religious bias. A science that is either religious or irreligious is a misnomer; we might as well speak of chemical ethics or Christian mathematics.

If the Church were to prescribe the course to be taken by science, we should unhesitatingly reject its claim and declare that it transcends its authority. But does not the same rule ap-

ply to science? If science lies outside of the sphere of religion, it ought to be self-evident that religion lies outside of the sphere of science. Both taken in their strictest sense and according to their essence form two independent circles which do not intersect and one of which does not lie within the other. If a collision is postulated it must therefore be because terms are used vaguely or because the one or the other transcends its authority.

The fact that in America and England the terms philosophy and science are used so loosely, often synonymously, is the source of much confusion. As a consequence, what belongs to one department is often attributed to the other. In Germany they are carefully distinguished, so that there a natural philosopher is not a scientist but one who speculates on nature. Schelling and Hegel wrote on natural philosophy, but they were not scientists; while in England and America books, journals, and societies are called philosophical which are in reality devoted to science. Owing to this interchangeable use of the terms it is the more easy to claim for science, on the one hand, exactness and certainty, and on the other to transfer these attributes to the speculations of philosophy. English scientists sometimes make a distinction between the two when they want to abuse metaphysics; but so inveterate has the habit of confounding them become that the same author may denounce philosophy as uncertain and then use it as synonymous with science.

While science deals with facts and their laws, philosophy deals with principles. The means used by the former are experiment and mathematics, together with reasoning based directly on them; the latter uses speculation. While the former adheres closely to fact, the latter begins where the former ends; and starting with the bases formed by science and all other knowledge, it goes in search of the ultimate explanation of thought and being. It thus becomes evident that philosophy and religion move largely in the same sphere and have much in common, and for this reason their influence on each other has always been very great.

Speculation is always powerfully influenced by subjective elements; and even when controlled by the severest logic it

cannot be made mathematically exact and certain. Leaving the facts far behind, it cannot be subjected to their test. Wholly transcending the limits of science, it is an abuse to call it scientific. While leading scientists oppose the admission of speculation into science, there are unfortunately, not a few who devote themselves to scientific labors who yield to the temptation to speculate, often very wildly, and then claim for those speculations the authority of science; and the masses, even when this claim is not made, are apt to regard the whims as well as the speculation of a scientific man as final. Thus mere assertions are received as a new gospel just because uttered by a scientist. There is surely urgent need in our day of distinguishing carefully between science and the philosophical opinions of scientists.

One can admit Darwin's great service to science without being blind to the fact that his works teem with opinions and philosophical speculation. Some have taken his opinions without his science, and have promulgated as scientifically established what the author himself was on more careful investigation obliged to change. He himself admitted that he had attributed too much to natural selection. Timely warnings have come from the leading scientists of Germany, as Virchow and Du Bois-Reymond, against the efforts of the disciples to be more orthodox than Darwin himself. Herbert Spencer's works are a strange mixture of science and speculation; the unwary reader is apt to imagine that the whole is scientific. He who remembers that these works constitute the "Synthetic Philosophy" will read critically in order to discover the soul of truth in things erroneous. The same may be said of Comte's philosophy, whose postulates have so often been endowed with scientific authority; whose rejection of metaphysics is lauded and then his own metaphysical notions are adopted without hesitation. In fact questions pertaining to evolution and design, as well as to the possibility of theology, philosophy, and of knowledge in general, do not belong to science at all, but to philosophy; otherwise they could not even be in dispute.

The rule that the shoemaker should stick to his last, is applicable to others as well as theologians. One need but read the

complaints of eminent scientists against some of their co-laborers in order to learn how liable a scientist is to err when he leaves his specialty. Inferences going to ultimate principles depend on logic, in which the experimenter may be weak; they involve mental operations which require special training. Du Bois-Reymond is not the only scientist who laments that so many of his fellow-laborers lack philosophical training and the ability to comprehend philosophical problems. One need but read his "Limits of Natural Science" and "The Seven Riddles of the World" to learn how common it has become for scientists to transcend their limits. The theory of knowledge, on which all our intellectual operations depend, is so neglected that scientists have felt themselves called upon to give instruction on the subject in their scientific lectures. It is not at all unusual for the empiricist to refer to nature what is really a product of the mind. The mental element in perception is often wholly ignored. Mere abstractions, which exist only in thought, are naively transferred to external objects. Very naturally materialism is the result. Conceptions as difficult as causation, substance, time, space, relation, and even matter and force, are treated as if self-evident.

It is no disparagement to science to say these things. Those whose opinions are most weighty are the foremost to check the flights of those who leave the exactness and reserve of science to settle points beyond their province. Those who imagine that the effort to limit science is done by theists in the interest of religion are mistaken. Virchow, Helmholtz, Du Bois-Reymond, do not profess to be theists. Buechner is an avowed materialist, yet he claims that the riddles of life must be solved, if at all, by philosophy, not by science. Haeckel, who is anything but a theist, complains of "the lack of philosophical culture which characterizes most of the physicists of the day," and declares that many of their errors arise from their "crude empiricism" which they laud as "exact science." When such empiricists make extravagant claims for their religious views it is well to inquire into their real worth.

It is important not to overlook the specialization in science which has become so common in our day. The natural ten-

dency is so to limit the mind that it cannot get beyond its specialty. The various departments of science have become so extensive that it requires a life of great diligence to master one of them, to keep up with its progress and do independent work in it. Referring to the development of organic chemistry within the last twenty years, Professor Roscoe said at Montreal that this progress is "so vast, that it is already found impossible for one individual, even though he devote his whole time and energies to the task, to master all the details, or make himself at home with the increasing mass of new facts which the busy workers in this field are daily bringing forth." At the same place the President of the British Association spoke of the difficulty of giving an account of the progress of physics since this includes subjects as distinct as mechanics, electricity, heat, optics, and acoustics, to say nothing of astronomy and meteorology, and added: "Any one of these may well occupy the life-long attention of a man of science, and to be thoroughly conversant with all of them is more than can be expected of any one individual, and is probably incompatible with the devotion of much time and energy to the actual advancement of knowledge." In the interest of thoroughness specialization has been carried so far that even scientists themselves are pleading for more attention to other subjects so as to give more enlarged views. No one can now master all the sciences; even a Humboldt would find the work beyond his powers. But if not even the whole of science can be mastered, how can the specialist take into account all branches of learning in order to get the last generalization and the ultimate conclusions drawn from the whole realm of knowledge? Science alone, least of all one of its special departments, cannot give a correct view of the principles of all being. Law, politics, ethnology, philology, ethics, theology, history, literature, are equally necessary, especially for understanding all that pertains to humanity and religion. The great principles on which religion depends lie wholly beyond any tests which science can apply; and he who accepts only what he can thus test rejects not merely religion but also all ethics and history and whatever most deeply concerns humanity. These principles lie behind the natural, the mental,

the moral, and the spiritual, all of which must be taken into account if the principles are to be discovered and interpreted. They lie in the domain of philosophy which deals with the ultimate principles of all things, but they can never be drawn into the realm of science.

Since science itself does not interfere with religion, the fact that the faith of so many who pursue it is weakened or undermined remains to be explained. When Huxley (*Lay Addresses*) speaks of the pain experienced when the religious convictions are shaken, he no doubt utters what many a scientist has felt. Controlled in their search wholly by the love of truth, their doubts are honest and deserve the most candid treatment. Perhaps it is not the study itself, but the spirit with which it is pursued or the assumptions that are made, by which the faith is affected. That the scientific spirit and method do not in themselves affect religion is proved by many eminent names from Newton, the most rigorous and the greatest of scientists, till the present day. But if a man determines not to recognize God unless he finds him in his science, he will have no other alternative than to become either an agnostic or an atheist. It is self-evident that he who resolves to accept only what is demonstrated leaves no room for faith; just as the man who puts all knowledge in the sense has no use for reason. Thus an exclusive attention to science may develop an exclusive spirit which ignores all other learning as well as practical life and the heart; and it may promote so one-sided a development as to endanger religion, which is a product of the whole man. Is it any wonder that he who trains himself wholly in what can be weighed and measured loses the appreciation for other things? It needs no argument to show that a purely scientific training, in proportion as it is thorough and exclusive, leaves important elements of man and thought uncultivated. The specialist is apt to become suspicious of all that transcends the test of facts. Not only are appeals to the imagination rejected, but even those to conscience and the emotions are unwelcome. Under such circumstances a knowledge of self, which is of the first importance in all religious questions, is impossible. Those who thus bury themselves in science do not realize that beyond its

realm there may be other knowledge which could never have been discovered by science and that there may also be a wide realm for valid faith. They sometimes treat religion as a mere sentiment; but they forget that then irreligion is also a mere sentiment, and that the real question is whether the sentiment rests on a reliable basis. One need but understand the exclusiveness of certain students of science to find perfectly clear what seemed so strange to Lotze. He says: "Amid all the mistakes of the human mind, this has always seemed to me the strangest: that it could question its own existence, of which it is alone immediately conscious, or that it could regard itself as a product of external nature, which we know only second-hand, only through the knowledge mediated by the mind whose existence was denied."

It should be remembered that our conclusions depend very largely on association and analogical reasoning. The subject occupying the attention mostly is likely to be suggested by other subjects and to be made the norm of all thinking. The artist looks at all things from an æsthetic, the minister from a theological, the idealist from an idealistic, and the scientist from a scientific standpoint. That there may be objects lying beyond the vision thus afforded is not considered, nor is the fact heeded that everything should be viewed in its own light. Under such circumstances the adoption of analogical reasoning is common. The mind trained in one method is apt to make its application universal. He who deals chiefly with the mental laws is apt to use them to explain all things. Anthropomorphism is extremely common; and some scientists hold with Feuerbach and Strauss that man simply transfers his own mental and moral characteristics to the Deity. Even force is treated by Schopenhauer and others according to the analogy of the will. It is well known that the mind is apt to transfer its own action according to intelligent design to other objects; hence men speak of design in nature where there can be only *evidences* of design. But the man who deals exclusively with material things is no less liable to the same analogical reasoning. It is not accidental that the physicians who make the study of the body a specialty furnish the largest number of materialists on the con-

tinent of Europe. The physiological laws are used to interpret psychological operations, and the spiritual is subjected wholly to the material. In treating the insane the physicians may attend exclusively to the physical basis of the disease, and when an autopsy takes place there is of course nothing but the body to be examined. He who by the peculiar method of his search finds within the physical nothing but the material, may conclude that nothing else exists. Sometimes medical students affirm triumphantly that they have searched the human system through without finding a soul. If on the other hand the search is limited to the idea nothing physical will be discovered. The materialist laughs at the idealist, the latter laughs at the materialist who expects to find a living soul in a dead body, the only kind that can be searched through and through. No man has ever found matter anywhere, a fact admitted equally by scientists and philosophers. We never discover anything but certain properties which we ascribe to matter. The matter itself is an inference it is thought.* There are eminent scientists who do not merely admit that we can know nothing about matter but are also inclined to treat it as an abstraction and to substitute for it force. Now since matter is known only by its properties, we can infer its existence only where these are found; and if properties altogether different are found, we must conclude that they are not those of matter. But analogical reasoning is so insidious that it unconsciously leads to conclusions which would be impossible if everything were judged according to its own peculiarities.

Only when the scientific spirit becomes narrow, exclusive and dogmatic, and when it is controlled by association and

*It is now generally admitted that we neither know, nor can know, anything of *Matter*, save through the medium of the impressions it makes on our senses; and those impressions are only derived from the *Forces* of which Matter is the vehicle. * * In fact, instead of Matter (as some affirm) being the object of our immediate cognizance, and the Laws of Matter our most certain form of knowledge, there seems valid ground for the assertion that our notion of Matter is a conception of the Intellect, *Force* being that externality of which we have the *most* direct—perhaps even the *only* direct—cognizance."—Carpenter, "Mental Physiology."

makes analogy its supreme law, will it be hostile to religion. So long as it is free, limits science to the objects of science, and remains susceptible to influences from other departments of thought and views them in their own light, it will no more be hostile to religion than to the classics, the humanities in general or to ethics. The President of the British Association said at Montreal: "Many excellent people are afraid of science as tending towards materialism. That such apprehension should exist is not surprising, for unfortunately there are writers, speaking in the name of science, who have set themselves to foster it. It is true that among scientific men, as in other classes, crude views are to be met with as to the deeper things of Nature; but that the life-long beliefs of Newton, of Faraday, and of Maxwell are inconsistent with the scientific habit of mind, is surely a proposition which I need not stop to refute." Jevons (*Principles of Science*) says: "Our own hopes and wishes and determinations are the most undoubted phenomena within the sphere of consciousness. If men do act, feel, and live as if they were not merely the brief products of a casual conjunction of atoms, but the instruments of a far-reaching purpose, are we to record all other phenomena and pass over these? We investigate the instincts of the ant and the bee and the beaver, and discover that they are led by an inscrutable agency to work towards a distant purpose. Let us be faithful to our scientific method, and investigate also those instincts of the human mind by which man is led to work as if the approval of a Higher Being were the aim."

Much will be gained by carefully separating science itself from its excrescences, which steal its name and at the same time tend to rob it of its exactness and certainty. When a man assumes an arrogant tone respecting religion it is at least worth while to inquire whether he understands the subject, is in a fit condition to appreciate it and applies to it the proper tests. A man may be very wise in some things and extremely foolish in others; and it is a pity when a man's wisdom is made the cloak of his folly. Here on the continent of Europe it is hard to suppress a feeling of contempt when young students of medicine, who have hardly learned the alphabet of their specialty and understand

neither philosophy nor ethics nor theology, sneer at religion and advocate principles which are subversive of all morality. Some begin their studies with this spirit; others echo the sentiments of a favorite teacher or author and become materialistic. Innocent of real science and of all profound independent thought, they dispose of the deepest problems of mind and heart with a flippancy equal to their mental attainments, and with an arrogance which claims for crude notions, wholly outside of the realm of science, the authority of science. All respect and honor to the scientist who is led by careful study into honest doubt; the probability is that no one else can regret half as much as he himself that his faith has been weakened. But just because we honor him so highly we can only look with pity on the parasites and triflers who destroy all that is holiest to the human heart, and then claim for their levity the dignity of science. All who attack religion should heed the words of Herbert Spencer: "A logical apparatus that is to overturn the deepest of human beliefs, must have an extremely firm basis."

## ARTICLE II.

### LIGHT ON BIBLE HISTORY FROM EGYPTIAN ANTIQUITIES.*

By the late GUSTAVUS SEYFFARTH, D. D., LL. D., of New York, former Professor in the University of Leipsic, Germany.

Several questions will here be briefly discussed, which for many years have engaged the attention of biblical critics and philosophical inquirers.

I. The question whether the deluge recorded in Scripture history was partial or universal, is not an indifferent, but a very important one, because it is connected with the history and chronology of all nations, with the history of astronomy, with general philology and dialectology, with the propagation of literature and science, with the continuation of common usages, with the primitive mythology and theology, with general eth-

*Transcribed from the original unpublished MS. of the venerable author, in 1884, with his permission, by Rev. William Hall, of New York.

nography, natural philosophy, geology and the like. It is an Italian savant, Pojana, who, in 1832, (Paligraphio di Verona, Vol. XI. p. 145), first put beyond the reach of controversy, that the Noachian deluge must have been universal. His learned treatise: "Della Universalita del D'iluvio,"* contains nearly all the traditions concerning the deluge, and in it he discusses the matter so carefully and scrupulously that no unprejudiced reader will object to his concluding words: "Doubting this universal catastrophe, would show how far voluntary, stupid incredulity is capable of going, both in believing what is incredible and in not believing what is credible." Nevertheless, the renowned professor and freethinker, Lepsius, at Berlin,—lately deceased—in his Egyptian History, imposed upon his readers the notion that the "deluge was confined to a small portion of our globe only," that "the Old Testament is a book of myths," that "it contains no real history," that "the biblical chronology must be arranged in accordance with Egyptian history," of course, as established by Lepsius' fancy.

This not being the place for reproducing the mass of Pojana's arguments, it will suffice to add only the sacred records of the Egyptians, written, as history says, only 666 years after the deluge, and what other authorities, unknown to Pojana, have to tell us concerning the universality of the deluge.

The Turin copy of these records, Lepsius' so called, "*Todtenbuch*," contains, in its first chapter, the following passage (Summary, p. 94): "I am" (says the Creator), "the Most Holy One who have trampled under foot the abode of the wicked; who have destroyed (by the deluge) the polluted race of the world, who have made the children of the deceiver (Satan), and the insolent in the habitation of wickedness upon earth, to tremble."

The same idea is involved in the symbolical myth of the death of Osiris. Typhon, (the water), kills his brother Osiris (the mainland), and puts his remaining limbs in an ark, which was committed to the sea. This ark having floated a long time, finally arrives at Byblos, (obviously Babel, the first home of the

*Translated and published some years ago, by Dr. Seyffarth himself, probably in this city, for the financial benefit of the Mount Vernon Orphan Home, Westchester Co., N. Y.

postdiluvian family), whereupon, Osiris reviving, comes out of the ark, and Horus, the son of Osiris, (the new earth) kills Typhon (the water of the deluge), and casts his body into the dead sea, being five times more salt than the ocean. Remember here, what Strabo (x. 3 474) testifies, viz: that "the ancients enveloped natural phenomena with allegories and added myths." Further, Sanchoniathon, the Phœnician historian, 1500 B. C., reports that in ancient times Pontus (the sea), overcame the god, Demarus, (אָדַם-אֶרֶץ, the earth), and nearly killed him.

Moreover, Pojana cites many nations which have preserved traditions of the deluge, *e. g.* the Italians, Greeks, Phœnicians, Chaldeans, Hindus, Persians, Chinese, Japanese, Mexicans, Cubani, Mitchi, Zupotechi, Micronesians and Scandinavians; but Humboldt (Vues des Cordilères) adds a number of South American tribes, as being traditionally acquainted with the same event of yore.

Livingston, met in Central Africa with a nation, exceptionally instructed, being in possession of a syllabic alphabet, who recounted to him the story of the deluge.

A decipherer of the Cuneiform inscription of Nineveh, in London, prior to Rawlinson and others, is said to have found a passage referring to the deluge.

Add to this that the different traditions of the deluge agree with each other, sometimes in minute particulars, *e. g.* the day, the month, the century. On a Mexican temple, the deluge was represented by an immense ocean, and a floating boat, occupied by a male and female only. Instead of the dove, already forgotten by the Mexicans, a humming-bird returns with the olive-leaf.

Furthermore, suppose the deluge to have been confined to a small part of Chaldea, or Canaan, or Persia, or India, or China, or Japan, or Greece, or Italy, or Egypt, or Central Africa, or Cuba, or Mexico, or Peru and so on; these different nations would not, unlike all other arbitrarious institutions of their own, have excogitated the same consecution of the Zodiac, and the same constellations, much less the same alphabet of 25 letters.

At that time there must have been "only one people." The construction of our week is according to the apparent celerities of the seven planets. And this very same astronomical week existed in Chaldea, Egypt, Italy, Greece, East India, Germany, Scandinavia, England, America, etc.

Johannes Lydus (De Mensibus p. 25), reports that the Chaldeans as well as the Egyptians, referred the 7th day of the week to Saturn. The Egyptian records (p. 65), mention that the 7th day of the week was sanctified.

Three hundred years ago, the Spaniards, conferring with South Americans, asked them if they observed a week of 7 days, which question was answered in the affirmative. The same Indians, being asked again, what they called the actual day, replied: "this is the day of the Sun." Strange to say the Spaniards report the same day as Sunday.

Further, the very same divisions and subdivisions of the ecliptic, and the same beginning of the Zodiac, are to be found in Chaldea, India, Persia, Phœnicia, Egypt, Greece, Italy, even, as we shall see hereafter, among the Indians of North America.

Again, the starry heaven consists at present, of nearly 100 groups or constellations. The very same groups are historically found in different ancient countries, especially in Egypt. Some years ago, two catacombs near Thebes were discovered, and their inscriptions inform us on what day and hour of the year 1320 B. C., each constellation became visible. According to these astronomical inscriptions, the constellations rose one after the other as follows: 1, Cubiti Leonis; 2, The head of Virgo and cauda Leonis; 3, Vindemiatrix; 4, Libra; 5, Chelae Scorpionis; 6, the body of Scorpio; 7, The skull and arrow of Sagittarius; 8, His feet; 9, Capricornus; 10, The mare instead of Equuleus; 11, The head of the stone horse instead of Pegasus; 12, Aries; 13, Taurus; 14, Orion, and so on.

In the next place notice the consecution in our alphabet. Each of the 18 consonants could be referred to 17 other places. And yet all nations of antiquity used the same alphabet and the same order the consonants.

All these particulars concur in demonstrating that the deluge must have been a general one; a conclusion confirmed also by

practical evidences. Whoever has examined but a little, the alluvious soil of our globe, knows that it consists of alternate strata of sand, clay, marl, loam, coal, gravel, and erratic blocks, sometimes 1000 feet thick. Such alternating layers, obvious in all lands from the north to the south, from east to west, could naturally not be originated except by gigantic long-lasting currents or torrents, involving the whole of our planet.

Further, about 30 years ago, an artesian well was bored in the interior of Germany, about 300 English miles south of the North Sea, and between two neighboring rivulets. As soon as the depth of 300 feet had been reached, a stratum of sea-shells was discovered. A number of these well preserved witnesses of the deluge, were placed before the eyes of the Society of Natural History, at Leipsic, where I have very often seen them.

Let us return to our own country. Take a walk to our wonderful, unparalleled Central Park in the city of New York. There on the eastern border of the Ramble, north of the Cedars of Lebanon, you will notice those immense granite blocks, reposing upon a hill of solid rock. These blocks, weighing perhaps from 100 to 500 tons,—what force has rolled them to the top of a hill, fifty or more feet higher than the skating pond? Several thousands Indians would not have been able to move such masses, and of volcanoes no trace is to be found on Manhattan Island. Besides these, many similar erratic blocks, or boulders, are to be seen in our Park, *e. g.*, on the Ball Ground and on the southern limits of the great meadow called the Green. And these blocks belong to a singular kind of granite, which is not to be found elsewhere, or in the vicinity, on Manhattan Island.

II. Our second object of inquiry here is *The end of the Deluge.* With respect to this, who can tell me with what year the postdiluvian era commenced? The days on which the deluge began and ended, it is true, were traditionally determined by the Egyptians, Chaldeans and Hebrews. And as the first day of the deluge was "the 17th day of the second month," that is to say, *the fourth day of our December*, the last day of the deluge, on which the dove did not return any more, must have

been the 7th day of September. But the *year* of this catastrophe cannot be determined historically.

For the present chronology of the Hebrew Testament is shorter by 1500 years, than that of the LXX; that of Josephus an orthodox Israelite, and that in the Hebrew Bibles of the Jews of Ethiopia, and that of the New Testament, sanctioned by Christ, the Apostles, and the Evangelists. The end of the deluge cannot be definitely fixed, except by astronomical, *i. e.* mathematical certainties. Remember what Gen. 1 : 14, says: "Let the lights in the firmament be for signs," *i. e.* for helps fixing historical events. Indeed it is a fact well known to every astronomer, that the 7 planets of the ancients, with names so familiar to us, first return after 2146 years, to the same places of the Zodiac which they occupied at any time. Consequently, any event of history, at which the places of the 7 planets were observed and recorded by the ancients, can be determined chronologically, by means of our planetary tables. Let us see. 1. History reports, that prior to the deluge, both an alphabet and written books existed. The New Testament witnesses, that 900 years prior to the deluge, the book of Enoch existed. The Indian Vedas report, that prior to the flood, sacred books were in use, and that, in consequence of their loss, men became wicked, whereupon the Creator resolved to extirpate the whole human race. The same is reported in the Zendavesta, the sacred books of the Parsees. Tretzes, a learned Greek author, states that all the antediluvian books perished in the deluge. The Koran (Sura 57), narrates that Noah wrote a book. The ancient historian of the Chaldees, Berosus, recounts that the Divinity, prior to the deluge, invented the alphabet and wrote books, which he delivered to living men. An Egyptian papyrus, written in Greek, refers astronomy and the art of writing, to Necho, who is, obviously Noah.

A Greek tradition says that, Cadmus invented the alphabet, and this Cadmus, referring to the Hebrew root, signifies the ancestor, that is, the original father of the Greeks and all other nations. Eusthadius, a famous Greek author, reports the Pelasgi alone to have saved the alphabet and that these *Pelasgi* (from

*Πελαγος* the ocean), were the family which by shipping, came over from the antediluvian to the postdiluvian world.

Pliny knew that the alphabet was from the beginning, (æternus literarum usus). The Phœnicians are said to have saved the primitive alphabet, but Pliny distinguishes the Phœnicians on the coasts of Palestine, from the primitive Phœnicians (ab aeterno) namely the Noachides And Sanchoniathon, the ancient historian of the Phœnicians, calls Noah the first Phœnician.

All these testimonies concur in evidencing that the art of writing was known prior to the deluge, and that it was Noah, though differently named, who invented the post-diluvian alphabet. And this conclusion is confirmed by the fact that post-diluvian alphabets agree with each other, in the number of their letters, their names, their figures and their consecution, especially in the intermixture of the vowels and the consonants.

Add to these, the specific traditions that the Noachian alphabet contains a planetary configuration, observed on the last day of the deluge.

The Phœnician historian, Sanchoniathon, reports that the alphabet of the divine *Taaut* (the wise Noah), was an imitation of the Zodiac, viz: of the houses of the planets, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer and so on.

The very same tradition is involved in the report of the Chaldean historian, Berosus. Xisuthros (another name of Noah) when he perceived the approach of the deluge (Berosus says), referred the letters of the alphabet to the circle of the sun, that is, the Zodiac; and the deluge having ended, he recalled the alphabet from the Zodiac and re-delivered it to the world.

The very same tradition is the substance of the myth that Cadmus, *i. e.* Noah, invented the alphabet by killing the Castalian dragon, viz, the snake-like Zodiac of the heavens. From the segments teeth of this curved snake, 50 giants, symbols of the alphabetic characters, (including 25 transversed letters) originated, of whom finally five only remained (the Labials, Linguals, Dentals, Nasals, Gutturals) by the aid of whom, Thebes in Thessalia, that is to say, Science was built.

Even Pliny informs us that the alphabet came from the Moerae, *i. e.* the segments of the Zodiac.

We omit the citation of many similar traditions, particularly those in the Cabalistic writings of the Hebrews, which agree with the aforesaid clear reports.

Now, what shall we do with these ancient traditions? Shall we cast them away because two Hyperboreans, Prof. Voigt in Halle, and Darwin in England, have imposed upon the credulous, by persuading them that the human race have descended from the monkeys, and that the art of writing was still unknown to Moses?

III. *The Primitive Language.* Our hyperboreans maintain, of course, that the primitive language of man was that of his progenitors, the monkeys. Modern Orientalists, on the contrary, believe that the Sanscrit is the mother of all languages first spoken on our globe. The latter idea, however, is certainly an error, because the language of the East Indians is a fine polished dialect like the Italian. The primitive language must have been a simple, poor, rough one, and of this character there is only the Hebrew.

Let us see what the *Noachian alphabet* of the year 3446 B. C. has to say in reference to the question. First, it is well known that the oldest letters, the Phœnician, Greek, Etruscan, Latin, etc., represented objects of common life, *e. g.*, a bull, a camel, &c., and the names of the same objects furnished the names of the respective letters. The first letter represented a bull, and the Hebrew name of the latter was *aleph*, and therefore the first letter was called *aleph*, and so on.

Now the same Hebrew names of the primitive 25 letters (Alpha, Beta, &c.), we find in Greece, Italy Arabia, and even among the Egyptian hieroglyphs. Although since the same nations in later times, did not speak Hebrew, it can still be proven that the primitive language of earth must have been the Hebrew or Chaldaic. Had the Hebrew names of the letters been brought in later times to the Greeks, Italians, Arabians, Egyptians and others, these nations would not have adopted these letters, totally unintelligible to them. But according to Gen. 11 : 1, the whole earth was originally of one language and of one speech.

Further, since the Noachian alphabet was, as we have seen, a representation of the Zodiac, it was necessary to refer the 7 vowel sounds to the same places in which the seven planets appeared in the Zodiac. But the author of the alphabet was at full liberty to arrange the consecution of the 18 consonants according to his pleasure. What then was the reason that he placed *b* before *c*, and not *vice versa?* Each of the 18 consonants could be referred to 18 different places. A mathematician has calculated that an alphabet of 24 letters admits of 620 billions of variations. This is easily said but not so easily comprehended. Suppose a man to be able, during a day, to write down 40 pages, each containing 40 variations of the alphabet, how much time would be required for reaching the end? Answer: 1000 millions of years!

From this fact we have to conclude that the author of the alphabet selected and arranged the 18 consonants for the purpose of expressing 12 words, each being referred to a sign of the Zodiac. And this gives us an inscription by which the question may be decided as to what was the primitive language in Babylonia, from which all other dialects gradually sprang.

IV. We turn now to another question to be contemplated in the light of Holy Scripture and ancient history, viz.: *The origin and substance of all Pagan religions?*

In Isaiah (51 : 7), we read: "Babylon hath been a golden cup in the Lord's hand, that made all the earth drunken: the nations have drunken of her wine; therefore, the nations are mad." The very same is reported by Plutarch (De Is. 377): "There are no different deities to be found among the Greeks and the barbarian nations, either in the northern or southern countries." Quite the same is attested by Cicero, Aristotle, Diodorus, Tacitus, etc.

Now, an Egyptian priest, Chaeremon, reports that the Egyptians worshipped no other gods than the 7 planets and the 12 signs of the Zodiac, and, consequently all other pagan deities must have been the same. Indeed, Jeremiah (10 : 2) says: "Learn not the way of the heathen and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the heathen are dismayed by them."

All these historical traditions have, since 1826, been confirmed

by a great many astronomical inscriptions, coming down from 2780 B. C. to 200 A. C., from which we learn that the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, etc., worshipped next to the Supreme God the creator of the universe, "the Father of gods and men,"—the 7 Cabiri=the planets and then the 12 great gods=the 12 signs of the Zodiac.

At present it is universally taught that the ancients worshipped local powers of the earth, being deified. But this chimera is plainly refuted by the fact that all nations of old since the era of the Babel tower described by Diodorus, worshipped, next to the Creator, the 7 planets, the 12 great gods, and the Earth. (See the Paris Mummy Coffin.)

V. *The Key to the Astronomical Monuments of the Egyptians, Greeks and Romans.* Diodorus, Cicero, and many other ancient authors bear witness that the Egyptians, from time immemorial, were in the habit of observing the places of the 7 planets in the Zodiac, and of recording them on their buildings and other monuments. Indeed several hundred of such monuments have been preserved down to this day, which represent the 7 planets together with the signs occupied by the former, on occasion of important historical events, *e. g.* on the days on which kings were born or crowned, etc. The key to these planetary configurations, inexplicable to Champollion, was discovered in 1826 at Turin as will be seen in my "*Astronomia Egyptiaca,*" 1833. Of the very same character, are the numerous planetary configurations of the Greeks and Romans.

This is a great discovery of the present century, for by means of such planetary configurations, the whole Egyptian history which down to 1833 and even 1855, was a very chaos, has been reduced to a system that cannot be shaken.

The same is the case with the Greek and Roman history. For, since no planetary configurations occur twice during a period of 2146 years, it is mathematically demonstrated that Petavius, whose chronology has been *bona fide*, propagated for 250 years, has antedated all events of Greek and Roman history by one, or two, or three years respectively.

VI. We proceed now to the topic of *Egyptian History astronomically fixed.* And under this general head we shall dis-

cuss, briefly the following questions: (1) In what year did the history of Egypt begin according to astronomical inscriptions? (2) How many kingdoms existed in Egypt since Menes their first king? (3) Were Manetho's shepherd kings (the Hycksos) the Israelites or not? (4) What was the name and the image of the Egyptian king who perished in the Red Sea? (5) What is the Key to Egyptian writings (hierogyphics)? (6) Some important literary monuments of the Egyptians. (a) The sacred Egyptian records of Turin. (b) The papyrus of the queen Matchemot, 1780 B. C. (c) Gen. Stone's papyrus, and Shishak, the Conqueror of Palestine 942 B. C. (d) The autograph of Manetho's Egypt. History. (e) Steel found in the ruins of Pompeii.

But first a few words concerning one of the first three pioneers in the department of Egyptian philology, who has been nearly unknown in this country, viz: F. A. W. Spohn, Prof. of the classic languages in Leipzig, Germany, and who having obtained a copy of the Rosetta Stone, about the year 1817, subsequently designed to elaborate a special work under the title: *De lingua et literis veterum Egyptiorum.* Accordingly he commenced it, five years prior to Champollion's *Lettre à Dacier* in 1822, and two years before Dr. Thomas Young's article "Egypt," in the Encyclopedia Britannica, 1819. During these studies Spohn was so modest, that he uttered no word to others, even to his most intimate friends, concerning his discoveries. After his premature and unexpected death in 1823, being only 30 years old, the University encharged me with the publication of Spohn's papers. I assented under the condition that each MS. should be recorded and delivered to me in the presence of a witness, and that the mother of Prof. Spohn should be permitted, after their publication, and being bound together, to deposit them in the University Library, to the end that everybody might be enabled to examine the contents. Having examined Spohn's manuscripts, I noticed that he had carefully occupied himself with spelling the demotic text of the Rosetta Stone, and some demotic papyri, but superficially with hieratic texts. The hieroglyphs were neglected by him because the latter were presumed to be ideologic. Spohn began

with analyzing the whole of the demotic text of the Rosettana into groups, to which he referred the corresponding Greek words. Then presuming the basis of the demotic words to be the primitive alphabet of 25 letters, but expressed by six hundred variations, he spelled all the groups and translated them by means of the modern language, into Latin. The hieratic characters Spohn took for ornamental demotic letters. Since Spohn had no opportunity to examine some 10,000 hieroglyphic, hieratic and demotic inscriptions and papyri, in 1825, it is excusable that his papers contain numerous and great mistakes.

Spohn did not know that from the hieroglyphs the hieratic, and from the latter the demotic letters originated; that the 600 demotic characters were abbreviated hieroglyphs; that regularly, each hieroglyphic and demotic sign, expressed syllabically, the consonants contained in the ancient name of the image; and that the language of the ancient Egyptians, was the ancient Coptic, related to the Hebrew. Nevertheless, the results of Spohn's Egyptian studies, obtained under such unfavorable circumstances of that time, deserve the respect of all friends of literature. I myself have appreciated them duly, in Spohn's Biography, prefacing the first volume of his work. He has correctly spelled a great many proper names, with other words, and determined the alphabetic pronunciation of many letters.

I add only, that in 1823, some months after Spohn's death, Young's Hieroglyphics appeared, in which the latter determined the signification of all demotic groups and that these interpretations generally agree with Spohn's. And by the way, I will observe that our Astor Library, that immortal benefaction of Jacob Astor and his son, selected by my friend, the late Dr. Cogswell, its first librarian—a library which is, in many respects, the richest literary treasure of our country, and with respect to Oriental literature, the most complete collection of books whether in the old or new world, contains both volumes of Spohn's work published by me in 1825, and 1831. Therein the confirmation of what I have said in reference to that eminent man, will be found.

VII. Our next topic is this: *Menes and the Beginning of Egyptian History Astronomically fixed.* Genesis, 10:25, reports

that "in Peleg's days the earth was divided"—in other words, that in the year of Peleg's birth the inhabitants of Babylonia were scattered, and, that each nation occupied the country allotted to it. Now the LXX, Josephus, and the Hebrew Testaments in Ethiopia, as well as the New Testament, count 666 years from the end of the deluge, to Peleg; and the end of the deluge (September 7, 3446 B. C.) is as we have seen, astronomically fixed. Consequently, Menes, the confessedly first king of Egypt must have settled there, not earlier and probably not later than 666 years after 3446 B. C., *i. e.* in 2780 B. C. This result is confirmed by the so-called *Vetus Chronicon* of the Egyptians, preserved by Syncellus; for this old chronicle states that Menes reigned subsequently to the beginning of the first Canicular Period, in 2780 B. C., July 19. Further, the Tablet of Abydos, at present in the British Museum, contains a catalogue of 38 Theban kings, from Menes to the last of the XVIII. Dyn., Osimandyos and Ramses the Great, who, according to their planetary configurations, reigned till the year 1647 B. C. As then the ancient kings ruled each, in general, 30 years, Menes must have occupied the Egyptian throne 1140 years prior to 1647, *i. e.* about 2787 years B. C.

Eratosthenes the famous mathematician of Alexandria, 280 B. C., the translator of the Tablet of Abydos, counts from Menes to Ramses the Great, 1070 years, to the effect that Menes would have reigned 1070 years prior to 1647, consequently about 2717 B. C. However, Eratosthenes' Laterculum omits two kings, and hence Menes must have reigned about the year 2777 B. C., which sufficiently agrees with the Vetus Chronicon, and the LXX, according to which Menes settled in Egypt at the beginning of the Canicular Period, and about the birth of Peleg, in 2780 B. C. In spite of all these respectable authorities, Lepsius and other Champollionists sought to impose his idea on the world, that the time had come to put off "the childish shoes," and that Menes must have reigned before the flood, and even before the creation, viz: either since 6467, or 5867, or 5773, or 5702, or 5652, or 5613, or 5303, or 4915, 4890, or 4455, 4400 B. C., and so on. Since Anno Domini 1839, not less than 26 different such chimeras have proceeded from the brains of

Champollionists. How came this to pass? Answer: The Champollionists care nothing for the Pentateuch; they reject Syncellus, because he was a father of the Church, and consequently a *liar!* And the Tablet of Abydos, together with Eratosthenes' record, in their blinded eyes, not a continued series of kings, who ruled from Menes to Ramses the Great, but a *selection* of the ancient kings of Egypt. And yet it is not so easy to eradicate sacred traditions as the late Prof. Lepsius imagined. For it is a happy accident that Menes or his wise son Athothis, observed the places of the 7 planets in the Zodiac, on the very day on which Menes arrived in Egypt; and it is a praiseworthy act of Providence that 16 inscriptions representing the same planetary configuration, have been preserved on Egyptian monuments, *e. g.* on the Temple of Osimandyos, 1730 B. C., etc. And since no planetary configuration occurs, demonstrably, twice during a period of 3146 years, it is mathematically certain that Egyptian history did not commence prior to the deluge, and not before the *creation!* but 666 years after the deluge, in the year of Peleg's birth.

VIII. Our next topic is, *The Different Primitive Kingdoms in Egypt.* It is another deplorable chimera of the Champollionists, that subsequently to Menes' colonization of Tanis, all the successors governed the whole of Egypt from Nubia to the Mediterranean Sea. Manetho does not say with so much as a word, that his 32 dynasties ruled one after the other; on the contrary, he reports expressly that *e. g.* the two dynasties of the Shepherd Kings ruled *simultaneously* with Theban and Memphistic Kings. Moreover, the Chronicon affirms that the first 15 dynasties reigned simultaneously in different provinces of Egypt and hence it gives them a reigning time of only 443 years.

Add to this, that the Old Testament itself distinguishes three co-eval kingdoms of Egypt, viz: *Pathros*, (which is an Egyptian word signifying the country of the south,) then the two countries of Mizraim, *i. e.* the eastern and the western parts of the Delta. The capital of eastern Mizraim, was On (Heliopolis), where that Pharaoh who had intercourse with Abraham, and the same Pharaoh's offspring, who married Joseph with the daughter of the High Priest of Heliopolis, resided. The other

Mizraim was the western part of the Delta, with the capital Memphis. Accordingly it was erroneously believed that the Pharaohs mentioned in the Pentateuch, were the regents of the whole of Egypt, from Nubia to the Mediterranean Sea.

Our position is confirmed by other Egyptian antiquities. For the Tables of Abydos, and Eratosthenes' Laterculum, specify the 38 kings who governed Pathros or Southern Egypt from Menes 2780 B. C. down to Ramsas the Great, 1647 B. C.

The Tablet of Karnak, on the contrary, contains two rows of kings opposite to each other, of which one contains 32, the other, 28 royal names. Thus it is evident that at least, three kingdoms existed *simultaneously*, in Egypt. One, of the kings of Mizraim, contains the names of the regents of Eastern Delta, the other of the Western, and both rows are followed by the 5th king of the XVIIIth dynasty of Theban kings. Hence it is evident that the two kingdoms of the Delta were conquered by the kings of Southern Egypt, and that the first king of the whole of Egypt was the 5th king of the XVIIIth dynasty, called Thuthmos.

Moreover, since 32 kings ruled in the Delta, down to Thuthmos, 1960 years B. C., as we shall see hereafter, it is apparent again that the two rows of kings on the Karnak Tablet, must have reigned subsequent to Menes, at the beginning of Egyptian history, 2780 B. C. The Champollionists knew that, and nevertheless they did not hesitate to impose upon the world, that, Egyptian history commenced prior to the deluge, and, prior to the Creation.

IX. We come now to another unexpected illustration of ancient tradition, viz: *Manetho's Shepherd Kings, the Israelites in Egypt.* Manetho reports that prior to the kings of the XVIIIth dynasty, Phœnician shepherds resided in Egypt, who, being expelled, built Jerusalem. Josephus testifies that the same shepherds, called Hyksos, which word as he says, signified both shepherd kings and shepherd slaves, were the Israelites, who dwelt 215 years in the province of Goshen, not very far from the abode of Pharaoh the king of Eastern Delta, viz: On, or Hèliopolis.

Manetho's autograph, which I discovered A. D. 1826, in the Museum of Turin, mentions the same shepherds called Bokshos—Josephus' Hyksos—properly, *Wiksos.*

The identity of these Hyksos and the Israelites, is further confirmed by the following arguments: Manetho, calls the first Hyksos regent, *Solatis*, and, in Gen. 42 : 6, we read that Joseph was called *Shalit* (ruler), which is the same word. Again, the Scripture counts from the end of the deluge (3446, Sept. 7, B. C.), to the birth of Jacob=Israel, 2209 years, and he was confessedly 130 years old, when he came over to Egypt. Consequently, the Israelites obtained the province of Goshen in 2079 B. C., and 213 years later, our Turin papyrus says they left Egypt, viz: 1866 B. C.

Now Manetho relates that the Hyksos settled in Egypt, 700 years after the beginning of the first Canicular Period, viz: in 2780 B. C. Consequently, the Israelites entered Egypt in the same year, or 2079 B. C., in which the Shepherd Kings came to Egypt, according to Manetho.

Furthermore, as the Hyksos went out of Egypt 214 incomplete years after 2079 B. C., they must have left Egypt in 1866 B. C. And Clement of Alexandria, the most learned chronologist of old, tells us that the Israelites departed from Egypt, 545 years prior to the second Canicular period (1320 B. C.), consequently both the Israelites and the Hyksos, went out of Egypt in the same year before mentioned, 1866 B. C. Again, an ancient tradition preserved by Josephus, Abarbanel, and the historian, Abulfeda, testifies that three years prior to Moses' birth, a close conjunction of Saturn and Iupites in Pisces, had taken place. The famous astronomer Kepler, having demonstrated that such a conjunction occurs only once in 800 years, and that the same conjunction had happened in 1951 B. C. it is apparent that Moses must have been born in 1947 B. C., three years after the conjunction. But it is universally known that Moses, when he conducted the Israelites out of Egypt, was 80 years old, and, therefore, the Israelites must have crossed the Red Sea 80 years after 1947, *i. e.* in 1866 B. C., *i. e.* in the same aforesaid year.

All these arguments concur in evidencing that Manetho's

Shepherd Kings and the Israelites were the same, and that they crossed the Red Sea, 1866 B. C. (on Easter day.) In the face, again, of all these historical and mathematical facts, Lepsius endeavors to convince the Christian Church, that Manetho nowhere mentions the Israelites, that his Shepherd Kings were an Assyrian gang of robbers, who conquered both southern and northern Egypt, but were finally expelled, many hundred years prior to Joseph's arrival in Egypt! The most amusing chimera, however, is that of a literary adventurer called Beck, who, in 1835, made out that the Israelites never saw Egypt, but lived in Arabia Petræa; wherefore they crossed not the Red Sea, but the gulf of Akaba!! Is not that wonderful?

X. The next topic of present remark, is *The image and the name of that Pharaoh who perished in the Red Sea, in 1866 B. C.*

The Karnak Tablet states, as we have seen, that the Theban king, who succeeded the 32 and 28 kings of the eastern and western Delta, was, according to the Tablet of Abydos, the 5th king of the 18th dynasty, called Thuthmos IV. The same Tablet specifies the following successors of Thuthmos IV. viz:

Amenophis, 31, 30 or 34 years.
Thuthmos V., 9, or 30, or 11 years.
Amenophis III., 31, 30, or 34 years.
Horus.

Consequently: 99, or 78 years intervened between the death of Thuthmos IV. and the first year of Horus. The latter is mathematically fixed by a planetary configuration, (*Rosellini Monumenti*), observed in 1780 B. C. Adding to this epoch the 99 years, or 78, during which the successors of Thuthmos IV. down to Horus, reigned, we perceive that this Thuthmos IV., must have died in nearly the same year, 1866, in which the Israelites went out of Egypt. Accordingly, it was Thuthmos IV., the 5th king of the 18th dynasty, who was drowned in the Red Sea, 1866 B. C. This result, finally, is confirmed by Manetho himself. For he calls the same Thuthmos IV., *Misuph-rag-muth-os*, and this name involves the following Coptic *i. e.* old Egyptian words signifying, *the man who perished in the bay of the Red Sea. Me-Suph=the water of the reed* (*algae*) is the familiar Hebrew name of the Red Sea. Who could expect

that after 3745 years, the name and symbol of that Bible-storied Pharaoh would thus come to light, who with his own eyes, saw the faces of Moses and Aaron, and whose just divine overthrow in the waters, gave rise to Miriam's grand hymn (Exod. 15 : 21), "Sing to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously," etc. This leads us to the consideration of that once perplexing problem, *The True Key to the Egyptian Hieroglyphs.* The principal law, according to which the Egyptians have expressed the words of their spoken language, since 2780 B. C., is so natural and so simple, that it is to be wondered at, that *no man from Clement of Alexandria down to 1845*, neither Young nor Champollion, nor Lepsius, nor Brugsch, happened to discover it. The so long-sought-for key, is the following (first published in my *Gram. Egypt. 1845.*): *Regularly each of the 630 hieroglyphs, expresses the consonants contained in the name of the figure.* And even at present it is an almost universally spread opinion that *Champollion* discovered the key to the Egyptian hieroglyphs, published in his "*Précis du Système hieroglyphique*" Par. 1824. To wit, according to Champollion, none of the 630 hieroglyphs signified syllabically, two or more letters, and every hieroglyphic inscription, consists half of ideologic signs, explicable to everybody's fancy; half, of pure letters. This theory, however, originated from a misunderstanding. Clement of Alexandria, who knew the nature of the hieroglyphics very well, witnesses that Egyptian writings contain partly letters, partly syllables. The latter he calls *συμβολικας*, which Champollion, not being familiar with the Greek language, took for *ideologic.* But *συμβαλλειν* and *συλλαβειν* are synonymous, both signifying the syllabic pronunciation of the hieroglyphs. The report of Clement is confirmed by Cosmas Indiopleutes, who states that the hieroglyphs are not letters, but syllables of letters. It would have been nonsense to say, that the hieroglyphs expressed letters ideologically. Moreover, Bunsen's work, "Egypt's Place in History," relying on Lepsius, S. Birch and other Champollionists, published 21 years after Champollion's "*Précis*" etc., says: "We declare, decidedly that no man is alive, who is able to translate, according to Champollion, one Egyptian line, much less entire Egyptian papyri." The bilin-

gual Tanis Stone, discovered in 1866, has been (putatively) translated by two Champollionists, Lepsius and Reinisch, but their explanations differ totally from each other, and it will be seen sooner or later, that Lepsius's interpretation of the 2000 words on the Tanis Stone, apart from the proper names, contains only 40 groups correctly spelled and translated. So far as my own system is concerned, I first published in 1825 ("*Rudimenta hieroglyphices*") two years after Champ. *Précis*, that the Egyptians did not use ideologic figures at all, but syllabic signs. In 1845, finally, I discovered that regularly, each of the 630 hieroglyphs signifies the consonants contained in the name of the figure; and this has been demonstrated, *in extenso*, in my Egyptian Grammar, Leipzic 1855. Since that time, the Champollionists, particularly Lepsus and Brugsch Bey (now a resident in Egypt) seeing that Champollion's system, as far as regards translating whole texts, was a complete failure, gradually deserted it, and clandestinely appropriated my theory—by a so-called *plagiarism*. Instead of frankly admitting themselves to have been blinded by Champollion's elegant French compositions, the Champollionists took recourse to the trick that the "great master" himself, must have discovered the syllabic hieroglypic key, but without saying it! Thus it seems not yet decided, whether secret fraud, or the golden, honest rule: *Suum cuique*, will prevail for all time to come.

XI. Let us refer now to *some important literary monuments of the ancient Egyptians.*

The sacred records of the ancient Egyptians were written, as history says, by Athothis, the son of Menes, 2780 B. C. The first copies of these sacred books I discovered at Berlin in 1824, and since that time, nearly 500 similar copies, of which three are to be found in the museum of our N. Y. Historical Society, have come to light. The most complete copy is a papyrus, measuring 75 feet in length, in Turin, of which the first book and many other parts, have been translated by me. Another is the papyrus written for the queen Matehmot, the wife of Pharaoh Horus, 1780, B. C.

Several years ago, an American gentleman, traveling in Egypt, was informed that an unopened catacomb near Thebes, was dis-

covered, and there he bought the papyrus, measuring 45 feet in length, which was found in the coffin. Of this papyrus, different photographed pages were sent to the Smithsonian Institution, and thence to me. This scroll is the oldest now known copy of the sacred Egyptian records. And I am sorry to add that this precious MS., being offered to the S. Institution for the sum of $1600, it was not acquired for our country. It is, at present, in the National Museum of Paris. The historical part of this papyrus, being to-day about 3675 years old, reads as follows: "She (the wife of Pharaoh Horus), returned to be united with the Creator (Osiris), who made the vault, (the heavenly sphere), for the immortal souls, viz.: the court of the deities who are living in God's dwelling (the starry heavens). Her (the queen's sacrificial) offerings, have been meat and pastry of all descriptions, grapes, libations, (offered) for the benefit of all her beatified Manes and their royal predecessors, which donations, she (the queen), made an occasion of all the great festival assemblies, viz.: the festival assemblies of the harvest feast; the feast for the collection of the fruits of the trees; the feast for celebrating the beginning of the cycle of the passing year; the festivity (for celebrating the day) on which King Horus began to be called a mighty god, instead of (king) Amenophis, the beatified defunct who was once the lord of the sceptre, the owner of the crown, the king of both countries, and of Oases, and of the copper and quarry regions of Southern Nubia, of the valley of Patron, who (Horus), was the image of the virtues, of the Lord Creator, the ruler of the deities and of the heavenly firmament, the former of human beings, in both countries and Oases, the almighty leader of the blessed Manes near him, the lord of the revolving periods, the governor of the growth of the earth, the weaver of both the visible and invisible worlds."

In 1855, Gen. A. Stone, of Massachusetts, while traveling in Egypt, bought for the price of $500, a papyrus scroll, and some other antiquities found on an exceptionally ornamented mummy, that had just been discovered in an unopened catacomb near Thebes. In the following year, Gen. Stone sent me an excellent photograph of this papyrus-scroll, with the request to tell him the contents of this scroll—nearly five feet long. Its his-

torical part has been translated by me in the Trans. of the Acad. of Sc. of St. Louis, Mo., Vol. I. 1859. Strange to say the mummy under consideration, contains the once formidable body of that General, by aid of whom Pharaoh Shishak, in the 5th year of Rehoboam, 946 B. C., conquered Palestine and plundered Jerusalem. Moreover, on the temple of the same Shishak near Thebes, a catalogue of 125 cities of Indea captured by his General and Pharaoh Shishak, is to be found. The names of these cities, copied by Rosellini and other Egyptologists, could not be deciphered by Brugsch according to Champollion's system. Some of those cities bear historical names. Thus Thimna, Joshua's inheritance, is called "the donation of Joshua." Shilo, the residence of Eli and Samuel, is termed "the city of the two prophets." Gilgal, where David, after his humiliation, was again elevated, is named "the elevation of David." Hebron (Kirjath Arba), where Abraham and his descendants were buried, bears the name of "Barucha," the blessed city. Some cities on the Shishak Tablet, are not mentioned either in the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, or by Josephus, but future investigations, like those of the immortal Robinson, may bring their ruins to light. How wonderful a providence that the body of a biblical man, a papyrus written for him with other relics, an autographic geography of ancient Palestine, have been preserved from 945 B. C. down to this day, during a period of 2824 years!

In 1827, during my studies in the Museum of Turin, I discovered an Atlas, dedicated to Pharaoh Ṭakelophis, 1060 B. C., on which the 72 principal cities of Egypt are enumerated according to their geographical situation, first the "southern," then the "northern," then the "eastern," then the "western." We omit to mention many other remarkable monuments discovered since 1826, and add only the great stele, found on the altar of the Egypt. temple in Pompeii, called: "the temple of Isis." This stele under consideration, passed, in Naples, for a jewel, and I obtained permission to copy it, first, after special application to the Government. Afterwards the same inscription was published by Brugsch, but without a translation, because he could not decipher it by Champollion's key, three words ex-

cepted. Lately, however, the fourth vol. of "Records of the Past" being English translations of the Assyrian and Egyptian monuments, published under the sanction of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, London 1875, came into my hands, wherein I found, p. 67, a complete translation of 20 lines of the Pompeian stele, made by *me*, and another by Goodwin according to Champollion's system, which was entirely *wrong*. The historical line of the stele at the head of the hieroglyphic lines, presents the following personages. (1) On the left hand corner, we notice a deity, ornamented with the head of a ram. Since the name of a ram *i. e.* Ail, both in Coptic and Hebrew, the god under consideration was: *El*, the Hebrew name of God Almighty. Consequently, the object of worship in the Pompeian temple, was not Isis, but the true God. Hence the same God is, some lines below, called: *Kennophi*, *i. e.* the Good Father, or Progenitor. (2) Facing this figure appears the Mayor of Pompeii, offering a house or dwelling to El. (3) Next to him we see the Emperor Vespasian, distinguished by all imperial insignia, who offers money for building a temple. It is historically known, that Vespasian, returning from Palestine, divulged Egyptian religion in Italy. (4) Posted behind the Emperor appears the Empress, adorned also with royal insignia. (5) After her, we see her first son Titus, and her youngest offspring Domitianus, bearing the same royal decorations. As Titus returned to Italy first in A. D. 72, Aug. 24, two months after Vespasian's death, it is probable that the inauguration of the said Temple of Pompeii, took place between 72 and 79 A. C. (6) Behind the imperial family, eight male and female inhabitants of Pompeii, praising the new goddess, conclude the procession.

According to the master of *guessings*, Brugsch Bey, this inscription belongs to the time of the conquest of Egypt by Alexander the Great 330 B. C. But alas! for this theory, *shell-marble*, the substance of the Pompeian Stele is not to be found in Egypt, but in Italy. According to Goodwin the Pompeian Stone is a funeral monument for a priest of Chorumis, who in Cambyses' days (523 B. C.) took part in a battle against him, but was saved. It is amusing to compare the different versions

of the Pompeian Stele, forming once the front of the altar of the temple of El in Pompeii, with each other and, line by line, of which one was made according to the principle that each hieroglyphic inscription consists half of pure letters, half of ideologic hieroglyphs explicable to everybody's fancy. The other versions, however, according to the rule: *Regularly, each hieroglyphic expresses syllabically the consonants contained in the name of the figure.*

It will be seen, by any fair inquirer, comparing the two, that it is absolutely impossible to translate, according to Champollion, any entire Egyptian text logically and grammatically without bringing out nonsense. But this makes no difference. The Champollionists continue to sing their hymn: "*Mundus ult decipi, ergo decipiatur !*

We close with the true translation of the first lines of this wonderful inscription, made before the destruction of Pompeii, which event happened in the year 79 B. C.

I. "This is the supreme Power, the Lord of the Sphere, who created the verdant clothing of the earth, the Creator of the forces hidden therein, the Former of the deities, the Ruler of the countries, the Generator of the nations, the Conceptor of the homes of the multitudes on earth. II. The God of the globe of the constellations on the compassing firmament, the Weaver of the vesture=the clothing of the compassed region in which all nations originated, the Progenitor of the Conqueror of the rebels (*i. e.* Vespasian). III. The Creator of the glory of the illustrious regent, the Manager of the terrestrial garden of all nations, alike the Lord, the Father of the managing regentess, his wife. The Creator says: I am the Sovereign of the deities, the Prince of the Sun, the King of potentates. IV. The Lord of all lands, the Progenitor of the illustrious emperor, the Originator of his family. I am He, whose right eye is the majestic sun, his left eye the nightly moon; his cheeks are both the resplendent vault, (or concave) and the tabernacle of the stars," and so on. These lines compared with Goodwin's translation (according to Champollion), will confirm the affirmation of the learned Bunsen, that; "after 54 years it is still im-

possible to translate *one Egyptian line by means of Champollion's system.*"

NOTE.—For a very erudite and interesting exposition of this remarkable relic of Egyptian antiquity, we refer the reader to an article discussing it *in extenso*, published in the Transactions of the Academy of Science, of St. Louis, Mo., Vol. IV. No. 2, 1882, entitled: "The Hieroglyphic Tablet of Pompeium, grammatically translated and commented on, by Prof. Gust. Seyffarth, Phil. et Theo. D."—TRANSCRIBER.

---

## ARTICLE III.

### MINISTERIAL ACQUAINTANCE WITH HUMAN NATURE.

By REV. J. K. DEMAREST, A. M., Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Gettysburg, Pa.

To no person in the discharge of his duties is a knowledge of human nature more important than to a minister of the gospel. At the same time it is popularly supposed that there are few persons whose acquaintance with the subject is so slight and inaccurate as his. It is granted that some ministers excel in this science, not those probably most reverenced, or regarded as most typical of what a minister ought to be, but certain who have succeeded particularly well in gaining comfortable livings and the applause of men, certain clerical magnates in the larger cities. But the obscure clergyman, who attends faithfully to his calling and is actuated only by a sincere piety, is commonly spoken of as more conversant with the world to come than with the present world, as more familiar with what he descries with the eye of faith than with what he sees, or might see, with the eye of sense.

Now, the compliment so paid us, doubtful in its intention, we are obliged to decline. The fact is to the contrary. In respect to the knowledge of human nature clergymen occupy a front rank. We admit conspicuous exceptions. We dismiss from view those members of the body who know nothing well, who have no habit nor ability of observation in any sphere, mere

wearers of the cloth, recipients of alms. You shall not judge the clerical profession by such more than other professions by those in them, whose professionalism does not go beyond their names and titles on cards and sign-boards. But apart from such, there have been ministers, of whose work the results were extraordinarily great, while their ignorance of men and things, and particularly of men, was notorious. Indeed has not this generally been the case with leaders—leaders who brought the inspiration—in great reformations, religious, social or political. It is as if God required a tablet on which there was little impression besides, when he would give to the world some fresh image of himself, some new, diviner message. The simplicity of leaders in great movements, like the eccentricities of geniuses appears often to be a consequence of their absorption in the one direction of their originality. But putting aside the exceptions of this sort, rare as angels' visits, and the exceptions of that other sort, which we confess common enough, we confidently affirm that you will find no class of men who see more deeply into and through men than do ministers. Why? To say nothing about some such knowledge usually entering into the motive of their work, their work necessitates it and is besides eminently conducive to it. All this may appear in what we are about to say.

But if the facts are so, why especially urge ministers to the study. Because they no more than others are already perfect in this knowledge. There has been but One on earth who knew omnisciently "what is in man and needed not that any should testify." And the fact that the minister's work necessitates this knowledge is itself the best of reasons. It is not with him as with physicians, lawyers, or merchants. True, the profits of the merchant may considerably depend on a skillful exhibition of his wares, on his shrewdly guessing what will be in demand next season, or what will awaken desire in men's or women's eyes. Yet on the other hand, the sale of goods, the need of which has been long and sufficiently demonstrated, may go on to success indefinitely with men at the head of the firm, who know little but their day-book, ledger and bank account. The clever lawyer may occasionally sway his jury and manage his judge through penetration into the characters of men, when an

acquaintance with the law might not serve his purpose so well. Lawyers make much ado about the science before us and have a reputation, unlike that of their clerical neighbors, of being adepts in it, an unenviable reputation however in their case since they are habitually thought of as keeping one eye shut and a finger beside the nose, when closeted with clients. The use of the imagination in medical practice has been reduced to rules. Books have been written on it. But the physician must know what the imagination of his patient is before he can reach it. Some physicians chiefly among specialists in the greater cities are like some clergymen mentioned a while ago, whose knowledge of human nature is their whole stock. "Verily they have their reward," which in the case of the physicians is prodigious. But the minister of the gospel must deal with men from first to last according to what he discovers in them personally; and even in his presentation of most high and sacred truths, truths which in themselves are eternal and unchangeable, for their discovery, for the reality and vividness of his own belief in them, for their judicious arrangement, for the cogency of their enforcement—for what does good rhetoric mean but insight into human nature?—he must be thrown back in large part on his knowledge of men, of men as they are around him.

Let us look into this more closely. There is, first, a necessity that the truths a minister presents shall be such to himself. They must be truths to his own faith, and that must be more than an intellectual assent. Almost every minister who reaches men's hearts and benefits them, experiences something of a mental and spiritual change after leaving the theological seminary. There he has learned what are the tenets of his own denomination. These are given out in class room, which for the time is a little world—a very delightful, little world—where the personal authority of the worthy professor weighs heavily. We do not mean to say that in all cases, if there is independence of judgment, some of these views are subsequently given up or modified. They may be, and may not be. But there must come a time when what has been accepted will be brought to trial. In what a childish, in what an absurd position were a minister teaching that all mankind are sinners only because he

has so learned from his teachers, or so read in books, even the Bible! Have I only to accept that truth from the Bible? May I not also with propriety, finding by my knowledge of myself, my consciousness, and by my intercourse with the great world around me, that there is in all men, in persons of every age, every class, of every instruction, influence and advantage, according to their own confession and showing, what the Bible recognizes and calls attention to as sin, infer therefrom something as to the Bible, be convinced so far that the Bible is the word of God? It is sometimes a most painful experience, when a man passes from the position of a mere acceptor of opinions to that of one, who can teach to others only what to his own soul has been verified. But only so does one become endowed with power. Bearers of messages in state affairs may know nothing of their purpose or meaning. But the minister of the gospel is not a mere bearer of messages. He must be himself a witness to them. When he says, "Believe ye," he must be able to say also, "I believe." A parrot in the pulpit is to all serious minds despicable.

Secondly, adaptation of the truth is necessary in preaching. The moon turns ever the same face towards us and the smartest astronomer sees only that. But the fault is to be charged on ourselves, that the great majority of men steadfastly look according to prejudice, habit, education, interest, only on some one face of the truth. There is less to be done by any public instructor in the way of discovering and setting forth new matters than of setting forth old ones but neglected, matters overlooked. When Paul wrote to Timothy (2 Tim. 2 : 15) of "rightly dividing," or "handling aright" the word of truth, he referred, as we understand him, to precisely this duty. As the head of a family at table with his children cuts for each his portion of bread, so must a minister give to each of his hearers his due portion. What is the portion to be given? That can be known only as the hearers are known. What, for example, could be work more superfluous, than to preach against Roman Catholicism to a congregation of Orangemen? What could be more likely to ground in error a congregation of Presbyterians of the old sort, than to preach to them disproportionately much on

human inability, or at all perhaps for the present on divine sovereignty? And will it be amiss to suggest that it will not be found consistent with the highest interests of themselves, that Lutherans should stop too absolutely at the point of justification by faith? The minister needs to know his men, not to injure them with half-truths; and, when he sees them already under the domination of some half-truth, to be able to force on their attention the other side.

But, thirdly, the minister is not only a preacher. To a considerable extent he is an administrator of affairs. He has, in current phrase, a congregation to "look after;" and in the circumstances of our day and land this is indeed a difficult task. Our churches are supported voluntarily, and the supporters are in many cases uncertain even as to their whereabouts. In a town of fewer than 5000 souls every denomination is represented, to say nothing of Catholics, Jews and the Salvation Army. All organizations consequently but those of the leading denomination languish. In addition to the rivalry between the churches themselves, often very ungracious and, in spite of what is said to the contrary by the secretaries of Home Missionary Boards, in the end unprofitable, if leading to gains in membership by no means so to gains in piety, there is yet another rivalry, larger though less intense, between towns, states, between North and South, between East and West. If the minister give offence, or, what is the same, fail to please, he may waken some morning to find his congregation gone. Then take into consideration of what material an ordinary congregation is made up. God has nowhere left himself without a witness. Never yet have we beheld that assemblage of professedly Christian worshipers, in which there were not some honest, truly spiritual people. But besides such, and to some extent even among such, observe what diverse types of character! One burns with missionary zeal; nothing is of consequence unconnected with the Chinese, the Hindoos or the Hottentots. Another despises such visionaries, and talks much about the poor, the ignorant, the neglected at home, for whom however he is not himself the swiftest to do. One loves the old doctrines and practices as we had them in the days of our fathers. Another calls you a bat

of the last century because you will not discern the transcendent wisdom of the new, popular methods, without which in this progressive nineteenth century religion must die. A hot ritualist suggests how much more edifying your otherwise good services would be, if you would introduce a few forms with responses; while in the Presbyterian church at least we are still startled occasionally by the walking of the uneasy ghost of Jenny Geddes. Some prefer your "flowery" sermons, but do not think them at all "flowery;" on the contrary, quite plain, elegant. "Why don't you always preach like that?" Others, you have noticed express a liking for precisely those of your discourses, which on a revision you have become painfully certain, neither they nor any could have understood. Here is a thorn in your flesh, the philanthropic brother, who is ready to push you and the Church down into the crater of a volcano for the sake of an unfermented communion wine. Can it be that there are more thorns about now than in the apostolic time? For here are others; those active sisters, who think, that there can be no Christian sociability except at strawberry festivals and pin-cushion fairs; or those sisters' contemplative sisters, who have strong conscientious objections to such proceedings, but are always willing to waive a point in favor of "our pastor, Rev. ——." Surely when you consider what a minister has to do, how he must walk from end to end of that shallow canoe, easily tipping, to which Mr. Spurgeon has aptly compared a small congregation, you will agree that to succeed he must have the administrative ability of a state-governor; and when you consider further, that we have in the Church, what has not yet been tried in the state, women's suffrage, and that all a minister's words and acts must be with a perfectly clear conscience—a perfectly clear conscience, mind you—in comparison with his genius for diplomacy that of a Talleyrand sinks into second rate.

Perhaps we have dwelt sufficiently on the importance of the study before us, and are ready for the question, how shall we go about it? But can it be gone about? Can human nature be directly studied with advantage? Is not a knowledge of it, like "common sense," a gift rather than an acquirement? With-

out doubt in many cases it is a gift. What was there peculiar in the circumstances of Shakspeare, which enabled him to make his dramas an encyclopedia of illustrations on this subject? Can it be supposed, that Shakspeare ever said to himself, "Preparing to write dramas I must study human nature?" Certainly Shakspeare was a genius, and there have been in the same way lesser geniuses. Dr. W. B. Carpenter, in his *Mental Physiology* regards "common sense" as most often an inheritance. He defines it as such a result of a combination of faculties, that its possessor without the necessity of conscious processes of thought at once reaches conclusions respecting the ordinary probabilities of life, a combination likely to be found in one descended from parents who were actively engaged in affairs. A knowledge of human nature is closely allied to "common sense;" and the ordinary probabilities of life can seldom be correctly estimated without taking into account the idiosyncrasies of the persons who may be concerned in them. The man of "common sense" is often precisely the one who makes the most exact allowance for personal traits. And if "common sense" is everywhere claimed but is in fact rare, so also, we may remark, is the knowledge of human nature.

However, a man may increase in wisdom. He may "take on" good judgment as he grows older. And so may he improve in acquaintance with the nature of his fellows. There are directions on this subject more or less frequently given in the examination of which we shall close this paper.

I. To understand your species you must move among them. To be a geologist one must have frequented the cuts in mountains or the dry beds of rivers, taking his hammer with him; to be a botanist, the fields with his box swung across his back. To know men, still to borrow language from another profession, you must now and then have got your subject, bought or snatched, into your dissecting room. We cannot say, that your work will be always more agreeable than that of the medical student, but just as he uses the scalpel, so will you occasionally keenly think, not only about what was said or done, but about the man or woman before you who said or did it, what was the point of view, the prejudice, the motive, what was behind it all

and very possibly what was its covering, what its disguise. No, it is not a pleasant work, but you may suspect yourself of sometimes finding it less so than you need. Give the benefit of doubts ever on the side of Christian charity and hope. No human being is wholly bad, and most of the species are much better than they appear.

It is often advised that theological students should spend vacations in mercantile business, in traveling, in peddling. But surely it is not necessary to our purpose that one should see many persons within a short time. A hermit may have more real insight into the heart of mankind than a hotel clerk. It has not been observed that soldiers, who live in regiments are particularly advanced in these studies, nor that those who take fares on railway cars, or at the gates of ferries, know more on the subject than do others. Here as elsewhere a few specimens, a small community thoroughly mastered will count for more than any, even unlimited, extent of mere superficial acquaintance.

Good reader! if you enter on this study and you and I chance to meet, pray, make no study of me.

II. Read novels and dramas. Spare all your friends. Save yourself the labor of climbing hills and vending Bibles and tracts. Acquaint yourself with human nature in your arm chair by the fire-side on winter evenings, or stretched on the sand within sight and sound of the sea on summer mornings. It is said, a pocket edition of Shakspeare, of George Eliot, of Thackeray, of Dickens, a volume or two of Henry James, of W. D. Howells will teach you more about your fellows in four weeks, than you can gather from your own observations in as many years. But we doubt that. Not for you are we writing, if you have weeks to waste on character-descriptions so characterless, or plots so plotless, as those of James, or of Howells. A sickly object must human nature appear to one who knows it only through the pages of Dickens. Thackeray is truer. He is well worth a study. So and still more so is George Eliot, though you must be much on your guard. Shakspeare is in this region prince of all. We have referred to his plays as a

very encyclopedia. But remember this; to read novels aright, to derive benefit from them presupposes some passably large, already formed familiarity with life. Only so can you discriminate and say, "this is true" and "that is false," Such books may help to cultivate the faculty of observing. Students of men and of social institutions have generally liked them and confessed advantage from some of them. But as a means to the end before us their value is much overrated. The reader who is only a novel-reader learns nothing

III. Better than novels are works of history, particularly of ancient, which has more to say of persons and less of institutions than modern history; and most serviceable is biographical literature. Here is no room for mistake. And if characters are diversely presented, if Julius Cæsar, Oliver Cromwell, Napoleon, Aspasia, Lucrezia Borgia, Mary Queen of Scots are angels to some, demons to others, you will learn much in marking the bias with which writers of opposite opinions present them. Never disdain a memoir even the most humble. The lives of persons we meet we can only dip into. Their youth is passed away like our own and their future like our own is yet to be realized. But a biography is a whole life. There we can note the age that follows such a manhood, the manhood that succeeds such a youth,—aye, and the child that sprang from the loins of such a father and grew under the training of such a mother.

It is but right to mention here a particular work the best in the world for our purpose, broader and deeper than Shakspeare, more accurate and sympathetic than Herodotus, more entertaining than the Chronicles of Froisart—the Bible. It contains a gallery of inspired character-portraits.

IV. There is a study not in our own day in the highest repute, which however the world cannot do without and will return to sooner or later and doubtless with all the former ardor, Psychology. To study the laws of mind and thought is but to study the A B C of human nature. We agree with what is said by Dr. Noah Porter, in *The Human Intellect*, that "the sharp and searching look by which one man sees through another and reads the secret, which he is unwilling to confess, is attained

only by the fine and subtle analysis which psychology fosters, and to which it insensibly trains."

V. It is conditional to success that we look in all directions and keep the mind and heart open, Narrowness is fatal. Much depends on sympathy. John entered most into the spirit of Jesus, because he of all the disciples was most like him. Does it follow that to comprehend the wicked we must be wicked? Must one be a thief to catch a thief? Then would I rather not catch him. There are people one has no occasion to know intimately. There are lanes and by-ways one cannot care to explore. Some discoveries are like some games, not worth the candle. But there are states of humanity, poor, ignorant and suffering, there are discordant views, with which we do well to sympathize. We must be broad and cultivate broadness, must overstep the bounds of mere sect, nationality, education and custom. Our brethren of the medical profession, the nearest related to ourselves, seeking to heal men's bodies as we their souls, do not understand men as they might. Why? Because they look too exclusively at their physical part. They sometimes forget that man is soul as well as body; as we, that he is body as well as soul. The very limited horizon of the law-office and the court-room may account for the fact, that lawyers too frequently regard men's moneyed interests, or interests of bodily safety, as their chief, and so miscalculate their motives. J. S. Mill has left on record his "continual amazement at that extraordinary want of knowledge of human nature and life shown by English lawyers." Ministers also may be warped by professional habits and too often are. Keep a constant lookout therefore, and with kindly eyes, at the windows of the parsonage. The congregation in which you live is but an exceedingly small part of the world and even the Church, inclusive of all denominations, is not the whole of it.

VI. There is an image of the whole world in every man's own heart. You perceive signs. For their interpretation look within. We commend the maxim which has been taught since ancient times, was taught by old Socrates as a summary of wisdom, the maxim inscribed above the portal of Delphi, KNOW THYSELF.

## ARTICLE IV.

### THE JEWISH-CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT IN SOUTHERN RUSSIA.

By Prof. George H. Schodde, Ph. D., Capital University, Columbus, O.

It is now about three years since the first tidings reached the friends of mission work in Western Europe and America of a remarkable movement among the Jews in the province of Bessarabia, in Southern Russia. The soul of the agitation was a learned lawyer, Joseph Rabinowitz; the central seat was the city of Kichinew; and the aim and tendency was the organization of a Jewish Christian religious communion. The first man to draw the special attention of Western Europe to this noteworthy development was the venerable Professor Franz Delitzsch, of the University of Leipzig, the life-long friend of mission work among the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Like a *vox clamantis in deserto* Delitzsch had for decades, against the indifference of friends and the mockery of foes, upheld the cause of Jewish mission work in the evangelical church of Germany, and the title of his little quarterly published in the interests of this work, namely, *Saat auf Hoffnung*, was significant. The new movement in Southern Russia might seem to be the answer to years of prayer and work, and no wonder that the veteran willingly lent his eloquent pen and weighty influence to awaken the sympathies of evangelical Christianity for the hopeful congregation of Jewish-Christians in Kichinew. He published a number of official documents on the character and course of this new communion, and to these, almost exclusively, we are indebted for our knowledge of what has been and is being accomplished. The first and most important of these is called "*Documente der national-jüdischen Christgläubigen Bewegung in Südrussland*, 1884. It is a small pamphlet of 24 pages of Hebrew text together with a German translation. It contains an Introduction by the editor, giving some historical data as to the origin and growth of the movement; then the thirteen theses of the new

congregation; then the Articles of Faith of the National Jewish congregation of the New Testament; then a Brief Explanation of the Faith in the Messiah Jesus of Nazareth, in the sense of the Jewish-Christian congregation now being organized, which, written by Rabinowitz as a private document, contains an Introductory on the inner history of the growth of the movement, remarks upon the kind of faith required by the new Jewish-Christians, and on the positive or ceremonial laws, treating, among other things, also of the oneness of God and the Trinity; then follows a Haggoda, or liturgical formula for the celebration of the Lord's Supper by the new congregation, in responsive forms; and, finally, a letter by a Christian teacher in Kichinew, addressed to these new believers, warning them concerning certain features seemingly contained in their theses. There is further an untranslated Hebrew appendix, containing a highly laudatory statement of Rabinowitz's character by the influential Hebrew paper of St. Petersburg, the *Hamèlitz*, and a German appendix containing the result of a colloquium held by the Lutheran pastor and veteran missionary of Kichinew, Faltin, with the new congregation on the subjects of circumcision and the observance of the Sabbath, which the latter desire to retain, not as necessary, but as something allowable.

When the statements of the first Documents were bitterly attacked by the Jewish press of Russia, and the attempt was made to show that really the whole agitation was confined to the one man and that he had not succeeded in gaining any converts, Delitzsch secured from Faltin, from the new missionary Faber and from Rabinowitz an indubitable proof of the healthy internal and external growth of the movement, and these he published early in 1885 as *Tortgesetzte Documente*, etc., a pamphlet of 40 pages. We have further, issued only a few months ago, two sermons by Rabinowitz, published in Hebrew by one of his followers, and translated into German by Delitzsch, and two sermons in Hebrew, only with Hebrew and Russian title, published also lately in Kichinew. These are all the documents accessible, or perhaps in existence and printed, but they suffice to give a clear idea of the character and growth of this remarkable religious movement. With the exception of

the last mentioned, they are all published by the *Institutum Judaicum* of Leipzig, an organization among the theological students and Christian friends in Leipzig, that aims to develop the love for the study of post-Biblical Jewish literature and to do actual mission work among the Jews themselves. The missionary Faber just mentioned is, next to Delitzsch himself, the leading spirit of this association and has been sent by it to Russia. This *Institutum* is a revival of a similar institute established over a hundred years ago at Halle under the inspiration of the pietistic school, especially by Callenberg, a pupil of August Hermann Francke, but which was swept away with many other monuments of German faith and gospel work by the *rationalismus vulgaris* that devasted the fair fields of the German church at the end of last century. Recalled from the sleep of a century by Delitzsch at Leipzig, it has spread, and similar institutes have been established not only at nearly all of the other German universities, but also in the Scandinavian countries and in the German Baltic provinces of Russia. These institutes are now organically connected with headquarters at Leipzig, and are rapidly publishing pamphlets and books that give important theoretical and practical information on the much neglected subject of Jewish literature and the work of missions among the Jews. Side by side with these, another factor has been doing an excellent work in this connection. It is now less than ten years since Delitzsch first published his Hebrew translation of the New Testament for the British and Foreign Bible Society. Yet no less than seven editions have been called for, and over 40,000 copies of the work have been circulated, the great majority of which went to the eastern provinces in Russia, so densely settled by Jews. This translation, surpassing in excellency all its predecessors, has been the means in God's hands for doing much good, and at the present day there are pastors in connection with some Lutheran synods in America who were converted in distant eastern Russia through the agency of this Hebrew Testament. Just what connection this translation has had with the movement under the leadership of Rabinowitz is nowhere stated in our documents, but it is known that the publication of the enlarged and stereotyped edition lately issued in

London is the result chiefly of this newly organized Jewish-Christian communion in Kichinew. From this we judge that this silent little missionary has been eloquent there also.

The story of the origin of this religious movement is speedily told. It differs in two respects from all other systematic efforts made to convert the Jews to Christianity, namely in this, that it is in its origin partly a political and partly a religious development; and, secondly, that it is in no way the result of agitation on the part of any Christian missionary society or its messengers. The work of the Jewish missionary in Kichinew, Faltin, who has been laboring there now for over twenty-five years, has had no connection with this movement. Rabinowitz himself says: "We Jews, who have now arrived at the faith in Jesus of Nazareth and have commenced to feel the strong impulses of his spirit, have come to this, not thereby, that the confessors of the Christian faith, who live in our midst, have persuaded us, in order to secure for themselves a reward beyond the grave for having incorporated the condemned children of Judah into the communion of their faith; nor have we come to this because the fulness of wealth and honor which the New Testament revelation brings has excited our envy. * * —no; we have looked into the open mirror of the Old and New Testaments, and have seen there how God has no pleasure in the death of the sinner, but desires him to live, and be converted from his evil way, and how he loves his people Israel, in order to make manifest to us the wealth of his grace, goodness and truth. * * Our thoughts have been aroused through all the miracles which Christ performed in the name and by the power of the one God, by opening the eyes of the blind, by curing the sick and suffering, and by going unto death for us and for our salvation, as a lamb is led to the slaughter, and by his arising from the dead and showing himself to his true disciples together with the marks on his hands and feet."

The external features of the movement are these: Rabinowitz was a lawyer and Jew of great eminence. The persecution of the Jews by the Russian authorities led him to plan their immigration to Palestine to settle, live and die in the land of their fathers. While there his heart was opened to the true character

of Christianity through the study of the New Testament. He returned from Palestine with the conviction: "The key to the holy land lies in the hands of our brother, Jesus;" and from that moment on the watchword of his whole life and work became the words ישוע אחינו "Jesus our Brother." He returned to his native city and began to preach his newly acquired conviction. Its character as well as the manner of its birth explains to a great extent the semi-political character of the thirteen theses, which formed the first and fundamental basis of the new organization. It was not Rabinowitz's intention to connect himself with any of the existing church organizations, nor was he urged to do so by Delitzsch or any of the friends of Jewish mission work in connection with the new movement. It was thought wise to allow the new agitation to work out its own fate in the line and manner of its origin, aiding whenever aid was asked, and advising whenever advice was asked. The character and course of the communion was closely watched and often compared with the growth of the Jewish-Christian congregations in the days of the apostles. Events seem to prove the wisdom of this policy. The leader and the led have apparently grown in knowledge and in a more spiritual conception of Christianity. Their faith embraces now the fundamentals of Christian doctrine, and Rabinowitz himself was some eighteen months ago baptized in the American chapel in Berlin, by Prof. Mead, formerly of the Andover Seminary. About the numerical strength of the new communion we know nothing accurate. The Russian government has acknowledged it legally; it is now a *religio licita* in the land. According to the last of the documents which were here present in translation and still more accordingly to the two sermons of the leader last published, the internal character of the congregation is of a very hopeful character. We present in the following, first the thirteen original theses; then their confession of faith; and as the latest expression of these people, the "Symbol of the Congregation of the Israelites of the New Covenant."

The "Thirteen Theses" read as follows:

1. The present moral and material condition of the Israelitish brethren in Russia is a decayed, distorted and discouraged one.

2. Under the circumstances, to sit in lazy idleness would signify to give consent to the entire ruin of our Israelitish brethren.

3. In order to better our circumstances, we cannot look to our rich people or their money for help, nor to our Rabbins with their doctrines, nor to our writers with their reasoning, for these are all bent on their own benefit, and the welfare of Israel is not their object.

4. Nor must we seek a refuge in leaving our birth-place Russia, in order to emigrate to the land of Israel, and just as little in an amalgamation with the native non-Jewish population of Russia.

5. It is our duty to seek hope and assistance here in Russia, through our own exertions, with all our heart, with the assistance of the Lord (Jehovah), the only one who can help.

6. The material condition of the Jews cannot be improved, unless it is preceded by an improvement of the moral and spiritual status of the people.

7. In order to bring to rights the moral condition, there is need of deep-seated renewing of a spiritual regeneration. We must throw away our idols, the love of money as such, and in its place must make at home in our hearts the love of truth as such, and the fear of evil as such.

8. In order to attain such a regeneratian we need a helper, a physician, whose person and medicine have been found reliable.

9. In order to find such a person we must look among the descendants of Jacob for a man who loves Israel, and who has given his life for the sanctification of God's holy name, and for the sanctification of the law and the prophets; a man who is known to all the inhabitants of the earth on account of the purity of his soul, and his love for his people, the children of Israel; a man, who, on the one hand, recognized the greatness of heart in his Jewish brethren, as they boasted of their noble descent from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and were proud of the wisdom which the law, received from Mount Sinai, gave to them, and who, on the other hand, saw through their stubbornness, and their proclivity in good and prosperous times to desert

the living God, their heavenly Father, and choose for themselves new gods, namely, the love of money and the sovereignty over their brethren through science and mammon.

10. The man who unites within himself all these characteristics, we have, after a thorough examination of all the books of the history of our people, the children of Israel, found in the one Jesus of Nazareth, who was killed at Jerusalem, before the destruction of the last temple.

11. The wise men of Israel, among his contemporaries, could not yet understand and grasp his doctrines and his salutary purpose, which was his aim in regard to his Jewish brethren, this namely, that he laid stress upon the observance of the mandates of the law that touch the head and hearts, and not the trifling features of outward acts and deeds. But we, the Jews who live in the year 5644, we can with a certainty say, that this Jesus sought only the true welfare of his brethren, and offered peace to his whole generation.

12. Therefore, the power of our love for our Israelitish brethren, compels us to keep holy, and to fear, the name of this Jesus, our brother, and, with all submission of heart, we should learn his holy words spoken in truth and love, as they are recorded and explained in the gospels; we should impress them upon our brethren and the children in school; we should receive the gospel books as blessed into our houses, and join them to all the holy writings which have been transmitted to us as a blessing from our wise men in all generations.

13. We confidently hope that the words of our brother Jesus, which aforetime were spoken to our Israelitish brethren in justice, love and mercy, may take root in our hearts, and may bring to us the fruit of righteousness and of salvation. Then our hearts will turn to love the true and the good, and then, too, the hearts of the people and the government will be turned in good will toward us, to give us aid and succor among the other nations, who live securely under the shadow of European laws, which have been given and written in the spirit of our brother, who gave his life to make the world blessed, and remove evil from the earth. Amen.

"The Articles of Faith of the National Jewish-Christian Congregation of the New Testament" read as follows:

I. There is but one living and true God, who is eternal, without body, without parts, without passivity, rich in grace, power and indescribable wisdom, who has created and formed, brought about and preserves all things through his word and through his holy spirit. All things are from him; all things are in him; all things are to him.

II. The true God has said to our father Abraham: Walk before me, and be thou perfect; thou shalt be the father of a multitude of nations, and kings shall come out of thee. And he made an eternal covenant with him, to be his God and the God of his seed after him, and to give to him the whole land of Canaan as an eternal possession. And he established as a sign of the new covenant that all the males of the descendents of Abraham should be circumcised on the eighth day after their birth. And when he spared not his only son Isaac but brought him to the Lord as a burnt-offering, he received the promise with an oath, that all the nations of the earth should be blessed in his seed.

III. In accordance with the Lord's command, Jacob, our father, and his sons descended into Egypt, and there were multiplied and became powerful. Then the Egyptians attempted by deception to injure them, and they made slaves out of them and pressed them hard; but the Lord sent Moses, his chosen servant, and performed signs and wonders in Egypt, and led them out from there with a mighty arm. Therefore he has commanded us to observe the Sabbath day in later generations as an eternal covenant and to celebrate the feast of the passover.

IV. The Lord our God made a covenant with the people of Israel on Mt. Horeb, and Moses stood between him and Israel, to declare to them the word of the Lord, and communicated to them the ten words which had been written by the fingers of God upon two stone tablets, in order that they should walk according to these, and he spoke to Israel all the commandments, ordinances and laws, which they should observe in the land which the Lord had promised to Abraham to give to his descendants as their possession—all this that has been written

in the five books, the Thorah, which we yet to this day have in our hands. But at that time, at Mt. Horeb, the Lord promised to Moses, that he would awaken out of their midst from among their brethren a prophet like unto Moses, and that he would put his words into his mouth; that this prophet would speak to them all things that he would command him, and he who would not receive his word, pronounced in his name by this prophet, should be punished for this.

V. The Lord our God has kept his promise and has led Israel into the land which he had sworn to give them, and has given to them true seers and prophets, who declared in his name whatever he commanded them, and these words are written in the books of the prophets which we yet to this day have in our hands, and not a single word of these has returned void (Isa. 55 : 11).

VI. After the first king of Israel, Saul, had rejected the word of God, the Lord rejected him also as king of Israel and took the kingdom away from him, and gave it to his better companion, David, the son of Jesse, from Bethlehem-Judah, and the command of the Lord was given to the prophet Nathan, to inform David, that he would make for him a great name, similar to the name of the greatest upon earth; and that his grace would not depart from him; and that his house and rule and throne would remain firm and fixed forever. And King David, sitting before the Lord, said: This is the law of man (2 Sam. 7 : 19).

VII. When the Lord our God rejected Israel from before his face, he transplanted them from their fatherland into exile, because they had sinned exceedingly and had angered him. Judah also did not observe the commandments of the Lord; they walked according to the example of their brethren in Israel. Then the Lord spoke through his servants, the prophets, that he would deliver up also this remnant of his inheritance as a booty and prey to their enemies. But they despised these messengers of the Lord, so that his wrath was enkindled against his people; and he was not again appeased, but he transplanted them out of their native country as servants to Babylon.

VIII. Already before Judah went into captivity unto Babylon, and later when after the end of the seventy years they re-

turned to their land, all true prophets with one voice prophesied (1) That the Lord loves to be gracious and will pardon the remnant of his inheritance wherein they have sinned, that his covenant with his servant David shall in all eternity not be broken; that upon his throne should sit a royal son upon whom the spirit of the Lord, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord, should rest, to shake the earth with the staff of his mouth. Fidelity shall be the girdle of his loins, and his name shall be called the "God of the whole earth." (Isa. 54 : 5) He will become the covenant of the people and the light of the Gentiles; he will establish justice upon the earth, and the islands will await his commands, until at the end of days all the nations shall hasten to the mountain of the house of the Lord; for instruction shall go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. (2) That the Lord, the angel of the covenant, this son of David, after the way has been prepared for him, will come suddenly to the temple of the Lord, and he will become like the fire of a melter of gold, to put an end to the wickedness and to effect an eternal righteousness, because the Lord has anointed him to bring joyful tidings to the patient sufferers, to open the eyes of the blind, and to lead the prisoner out of the prison. (3) Thus through him the seed of Jacob and his offspring shall become known among the Gentiles and among the nations; and all who see them will acknowledge them as the seed of the Blessed-one of the Lord, and will call them the holy people, the Saved of the Lord. And from among them shall be sent out certain ones to the Gentiles and to the distant islands, to declare and to preach the glory of the Lord among the Gentiles. Something new will come into existence on earth, and the former things will not longer be remembered and will not be taken to heart. (4) For all those estranged from God, who have without heeding listened to the preaching, will become hungry and thirsty, and will woefully lament and will let their names behind them by which the chosen-one of the Lord shall make their oath. (5) This Messiah, the son of David, will shoot up like a root out of the earth, and it will not be believed that the arm of the Lord is revealed over him. He will be pierced for our sins and be destroyed for our transgres-

sions; he will suffer and not open his mouth and will be torn out of the land of the living, and while giving his life over unto death he will bear the sins of many and will begin to petition for the godless; and as he gives up his soul as a sin-offering he will see descendants who shall live for a long duration and the plans of the Lord will be effected through his hand.

IX. The word of the Lord to Abraham our father and to Moses our prophet, and to David our king, and to his servants, the live prophets, was fulfilled and carried out about seventy years before the destruction of our second temple; for the Lord has taken pity upon his people, and has exalted the horn of our salvation in the house of David his servant, and has caused to shoot forth the righteous branch, namely the Lord Jesus, the Christ, who has gone forth for us from Bethlehem, the city of David, in order to become the ruler of Israel—he the mighty son of the Most High, to whom his father had given the throne of David. He it is who rules over the house of Jacob eternally, and his kingdom has no end. He has suffered and has been crucified and has been buried for our salvation; he has arisen again from the dead and lives, and behold, he sits at the right hand of our Father in heaven.

X. According to the council of the unsearchable wisdom of God, our fathers were stricken with hardness of heart, and the Lord has punished them with the spirit of deep sleep, so that they rejected Jesus the Christ and sinned against him unto the present day, in order to incite the other nations of the earth to all the greater zeal and thus to contribute to the reconciliation of the world, since these nations believed in this Jesus the Christ, the son of David, our king, when they heard his gospel of salvation taught by his messengers that publish peace (Isa. 52 : 7), who had been disgracefully cast out by the congregation of Israel. But now, since in consequence of our sins against the Christ of God, the world has become rich in the faith in this Christ, and now since in consequence of our unbelief the times of the Gentiles has been fulfilled (Luke 21 : 24) and these have entered [into the kingdom of God] in full numbers, our time has also come to enter in full numbers, so that we also, the descendants of Abraham, may become blessed

through our faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and that the God of our fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, may again take mercy upon us, and again engraft the branches broken off into our holy root, in Jesus, and in this manner all Israel partake of the eternal salvation, and Jerusalem, our holy city, may again be rebuilt and the throne of David be established for ever and ever. Amen.

The "Symbol of the Congregation of Israelites of the New Covenant" reads as follows:

"1. I believe with an unwavering faith that our Father in Heaven is the living, true, and eternal God, who has created the heaven and the earth and all things visible and invisible through His Word and His Holy Spirit. He is one; all things are from Him, and all things are in him, and all things are to Him.

"2. I believe with an unwavering faith that our Father in Heaven, in accordance with his promises given to our father, our prophets, and our King David, the son of Jesse, has awakened for Israel a Redeemer—namely, who was born of Mary the virgin, in the city of Bethlehem, of Judea, who suffered, was crucified, died, and was buried for our salvation; who arose again from the dead and lives, and behold He is sitting at the right hand of our Father in Heaven, and will come from there to judge the circuit of the earth, the living and the dead, and He is King over the house of Jacob forever, and His kingdom knows no end.

"3. I believe with an unwavering faith that according to the determination of God to pass judgment, and His foreknowledge, our fathers were stricken with hardness of heart, that they blasphemously resisted their Messiah, the Lord Jesus, in order to arouse the other nations of the earth to all the greater zeal, and to reconcile them all through their faith in Christ, according to the words of His evangelists, in order that the earth should be full of the knowledge of the Lord, and that the Lord should be King over the whole earth.

"4. I believe with an unwavering faith that only through faith in Jesus, the Messiah, any man can be justified, without the works of the law, and that there is one God, who, through faith, justifies the circumcised Jews and the uncircumcised Gen-

tiles, and that there is no difference between Jews and Greeks, servants and freemen, men and women; they are all one in Christ.

"5. I believe with an unwavering faith in one holy apostolic Church.

"6. I confess one baptism unto the forgiveness of sin.

"7. I wait for the resurrection and the recalling of the dead unto everlasting life. Amen."

---

## ARTICLE V.

### "GOD IS LOVE."

By Rev. S. E. Furst, A. M., Salona, Pa.

Scientists have much to say about the "law scheme" which some of them claim furnishes a sufficient explanation of the universe and of all it contains. A trans-atlantic writer has recently argued plausibly and learnedly about "natural law in the spiritual world," and the advocates of the "new theology," or "progressive theology" as they prefer to style it, seek to readjust the doctrines of the atonement, of eschatology, etc., so as to harmonize these and kindred doctrines with their peculiarly "advanced" views and strikingly modern statements concerning the most weighty interests of mankind.

It is not open, boisterous, hideous infidelity, that is easily recognized by all and that repels because of its shocking character, against which the representatives of Christianity must contend in the present day, so much as against subtle, so-called philosophical, scientific, genteel, insinuating presentations of theories that are all the more dangerous by reason of their strange admixture with certain phases of truth and therefore, in too many quarters, likely to be accorded at least semi-respectability and quasi-acceptance.

This theorizing, these schemes and gropings, also clearly evidence the fact that the weapons used in the warfare of the present generation between truth and error are more delicately tempered, more exquisitely refined and far keener edged, and

must be much more dexterously manipulated than in by-gone days, although many of them may be made of very poor material that can not long endure.

We likewise observe remarkable delineations of intense thought moving with a yet intenser activity in the cultured mind of this decade on the profoundest subjects that can challenge man's attention—an intensity in intellectual struggle and a rapidity to which history furnishes no parallel.

The world moves swiftly in the now and those who would not be left behind must needs bestir themselves and begird themselves until fully panoplied for every action in the stirring scenes of to-day's life.

If it must be law, laws and systems of laws fashioning, upholding, directing and controlling all, let it be so, provided all will always give due heed and the best thought and the deepest and highest and broadest and most devout thinking to that law which is the fundamental of fundamentals *i. e.* "God is love." Herein can be found both a starting point and a resting place. Here shines the light that makes the way clear. Here is life—antecedent life—all life; and law—all law, the first principle of all laws. Here is true wisdom and here is all-embracing love, for here is God. Let us reverently approach this holy ground.

God alone, strictly speaking, is a law unto himself, and that law is love. In this he has enveloped himself, and all his manifestations, however august and awe-inspiring, are by and through its operations. In the infinite counsels that determined to speak into existence the universe of worlds and man, this first law was observed, for the resultant creations have ever been in harmony with it, in overwhelming proof of the fact that without its constant operation there must be unbounded confusion, impenetrable chaos, inevitable destruction.

Countless worlds around worlds revolving, myriad whirlings in measureless distances, velocities that can not be computed, infinitessimal accuracies in unfathomable space, never in conflict, never in collision, noiseless in immensity, without jar, without discord, all prove the governing principle of the first great law of the great lawmaker. The long, successive periods of which

Geology treats, the marvelous formations, adaptations, convulsions, quiescences of ages past for the benefit of ages future—the wonders, the beauties, the perfections which true natural science brings to light—the harmonies, the grandeur, the sublimity, the unity of everything that true philosophy has touched, make assurance doubly sure that the law of love pervades, permeates, vitalizes, actualizes all discovered phenomena of nature with indubitable proof everywhere, appearing in all things as if in characters of living light and indescribable beauty, declaring with unmistakable clearness, speaking with heart-thrilling distinctness, and with unreserved confidence and soul-stirring affection whispering "that predominating law is God—for 'God is love.'"

This all-comprehensive law makes the largest and best provision for the highest object of creation. Accordingly we find a Paradise, including everything that can minister delight in holy development, into the midst of which is placed man "created in the image of God," with his help-meet "bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh"—the twain-one—with the injunction "be ye fruithful and multiply," and God walking in the Garden and talking with them.

Evil comes and mars the blessedness of the holy scene and the time-long soul-struggle begins. Why did not this great law at once and forever suppress, exclude, destroy, utterly crush out the evil? That were to compress itself, to contract its own work, to limit its boundless operations and, this would be self-contradictory.

Man to be man must have liberty of choice, freedom of will, complete harmony with perfect purity, through perfect voluntary obedience to the perfect law in the exercise and execution of which his Creator had encompassed himself for the greatest good of all his creatures. To be denied the dignity of this free agency were to make man an automaton, a sub-sub-agent, a machine.

But our primordial law, abundantly equal to every trying contingency, more than ample for all possible occasions, promptly meets and adjusts the temporal and eternal situation as foreseen. Merciless destruction of the disobedient, rebel-

lious creature is not the remedy the law of love prescribes. The evil must be overcome by strictest justice administered in perfect love—satisfaction of the violated law must be made in all-sufficing atonement.

But, by reason of the corrupted nature, man is blind as to his now fallen condition and helpless to relieve himself even if he could realize his necessity. He has learned to know evil and lest he become immortal in evil, a demon beyond the possibility of redemption, love demands his banishment from the place of his fall, securely guards the entrance-way with flaming sword, subjects him, with all the severity of perfect love, to the purifying fires of bodily, mental and spiritual discipline, including material dissolution, that he may become "more than conqueror" through divine love, and come forth resurrected and enter glorified into a better than earthly Paradise from which this same law of love necessarily forever excludes all evil.

In order to reach this glorious consummation at last, man must be made to realize the weight of the evil which he has brought upon himself and hence the long centuries of training to which the race is subjected.

The Mosaic code of laws, ceremonial, civil and moral,—the foundation of all correct human laws,—is a development of our first great law adapted to the post-fall situation of man, to prepare him for the better state in reservation, until he shall become "meet to be partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light" by availing himself, in this state of probation, of the rich provisions divine grace has furnished in love.

Directions are given, in detail, relating to food, cleanliness, prevention of disease, disinfection of diseased persons and things, as well as how to secure and maintain, domestic, social and national prosperity and happiness, inculcating habits of thought and modes of action most conducive to the general and individual welfare of all who will obey, and, at the same time, by sacrifices and worship, impressing and convicting of the heinousness of sin, prefiguring the necessity of a complete atonement, requiring first fruits and first born, enjoining strictest regularity and earnest devotion, leading man upward from self and sublunary things toward the object of his worship, teaching hu-

man unworthiness, sinful wretchedness and mortal helplessness, raising the heart to the creator, preserver and sanctifier of all who approach him in the manner provided by infinite wisdom and divine love.

Obedience is emphasized and graciously rewarded—disobedience is condemned and duly punished. Those who will not yield to the right, who stubbornly resist every inducement to lead the true life, who irreverently reject the truth as conveyed in the impressive object-lessons of the prescribed rites and ceremonies, who blasphemously desecrate the sacred places and holy things, who willfully seek the destruction of the faithful and true, are themselves visited with the destruction that the primary law of love requires in the interests of righteousness, justice and peace, that wrong may not prevail over right, that wickedness may not triumph over holiness, that indescribable misery and unspeakable agony may not displace blessed purity and unbounded love.

While this special training and specific development is going on among "the chosen," "the peculiar people," through the same centuries the rest of the human race on earth are brought to realize the complete ignorance and helplessness of man in his darkened, corrupted condition since his necessary expulsion from the Garden of Eden. This is strikingly witnessed, almost if not quite to a demonstration, in the writings that have come down to us from the most refined Grecian philosophers of the last century and a half before the incarnation.

When at last the race is ready, "in the fulness of time," this law appears personified in a human body. He who is love comes to earth and tabernacles among men, the God-man, the perfect exemplar, the maker, the fulfiller, the judge, the executor of the law, himself that law. Without making the divine human and without making the human divine, yet uniting the divine and human he makes possible the inseparable union of the faithful with their deliverer—a union against which the powers of evil may contend in vain.

This personification of the fundamental law of love, of the foundation principle of all principles, this embodiment in human form of all power, all wisdom, of all in all, was, and is now, and

forever shall be, the overwhelming, omnipresent refutation of the non-believers' presumptive assertion of an "impersonal force" somewhere in the "unknowable" controlling the known.

This is the true key that unlocks the mystery of all being. Man sees, hears, touches, knows, loves HIM. John 17 : 3, "And this is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ." John 1 : 3, 4, "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that hath been made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men."

No "impersonal force," neither "inaccessible," "infinitely remote," nor "unknowable" something, but a little child, a pure babe,—not in courtly palace to be approached in state only by the favored few,—but, in the manger, in the arms of the humble virgin-mother, visited and glorified by the poor shepherds of the plain coming from their night watch. No vast possessions are required, no concentrated influence, nor philosophical acumen to gain access to the great First Cause in the form of this unspeakable gift: "God manifest in the flesh," to be taken into actual and inalienable possession "without money and without price" by wretched rebels, and this so distinctly offered that "he may run that readeth," so plainly spoken that "the common people heard gladly."

Hear the announcement: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem which killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you, desolate," (Matt. 23 : 37, 38; Luke 13 : 34, 35). Oh, how desolate is the Christless mortal—destined to be immortal in utterest desolation! But they will not. Again, behold the depth of love that restrains its almighty power from instantaneously crushing the obdurate creature whilst obstinately resisting its merciful creator bending over it in lowliest humiliation, pleading, beseeching, weeping, hungering, thirsting, agonizing, dying that it might yield and look and believe and live and become sanctified and enter with him into his unchangeable, eternal glory.

And those who will are enabled to accept the offer on the

terms upon which the tender is made, viz.: complete surrender of self to the highest and best being offering himself, the life-principle which was in the beginning and is and ever shall be, "the first and the last"—the "Alpha and Omega." Having received into himself this life-germ, fountain of all life, the happy possessor, illuminated with the spirit of never-fading light and infinite wisdom, walks in the light spiritually discerning the truth and thus becomes sanctified more and more into a oneness with him in whom "is no darkness at all." Thus transformed, old things having passed away and all things having become new, he has little difficulty in tracing his loving Father's hand in the formation and preservation of everything for the good of his children. Being a son now he recognizes his elder brother, with whom he is now joint-heir of all things, seated on the throne of all power, ruling in love for the unutterable glory of the Father and the everlasting blessedness of his redeemed family.

Now in child-like frame of mind, divested of preconceived opinions, open to conviction at every step, glad to receive information concerning every point, as he eagerly addresses himself to a careful examination of his father's work, zealously striving to imitate his elder brother's example, under the guidance of the Spirit of Life, with the law of love imbedded in his own heart he finds that law beaming forth in every blade of grass, expanding on every leaf of the trees, enriching all the fruits of the earth, blooming in each little flower, glistening in the numberless grains of sand, glittering in the dew-drop and frost-crystal, singing in every rivulet, ringing through the vales, echoing in all the mountains, sparkling on the ocean, flashing in the lightning, reverberating in every thunder-cloud, shining in the stars, reflected in the moon, blazing in the sun, making sweetest and grandest melody in all the harmonies of nature. With uplifted spirit, enlightened mind, satisfied soul, he smiles in the love that encompasses him encircled by his loving father's strength-imparting arm.

The trustful boy depends upon his earthly father who has been careful never to disappoint his child, and, without misgivings, runs to his devoted mother who ever soothes him in his

infant and youthful headaches and heartaches. A few years pass and that strong father and true mother become enfeebled with age. Their boy is a man now and cares for his beloved parents as tenderly as they watched over him in childhood. But the weight of life's responsibilities is upon him. His own wife and children confidently look up to him for maintenance and sustenance. As he places to rest, in the sleep that knows no earthly waking, the dear bodies of his fond parents, he feels too keenly to express, his crying need of succor by one stronger, greater, better, wiser than himself. "When my father and my mother forsake me, then Jehovah will take me up." (Ps. 27 : 10).

Instead of fruitlessly longing for the return of the days of youth, with his parents restored to him as of yore, the full-grown believer has a surer stay that seems nearer and dearer as the sense of helplessness increases. As loved ones depart from the trying discipline of this world into the state of perfection in Paradise, he discovers that the sacred ties drawing him heaven-ward grow firmer as their number is augmented. While his own natural strength is abating his feeling of greater security is constantly enhanced by the true operation of the law of love about him, beneath him, above him, within him. All the vicissitudes of earthly life, with its sorest trials, severest disappointments, intensest afflictions, direst bereavements, serve him as so many timely admonitions given in tenderest love. "For our light affliction, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." (2 Cor. 4 : 17, 18.) He thus experiences the working of the spiritual law in the natural world and sees neither time nor occasion to search for "natural law in the spiritual world." He is in felicitous realization of the greater including the less. He longs for an "abiding" presence and, with joyous heart welling over with gratitude, he experiences that presence mightier than strongest earthly father, tenderer than fondest mortal mother.

Himself a father he knows that when the ferocious brute will not permit itself to be controlled, rather than let it destroy his

children he will take the life of the venomous beast. Likewise he can understand that pure love necessitates the removal of the instrument of evil that will persist in going beyond restraint towards its own destruction, bearing with it to its irretrievable doom all it can contaminate. He sees the perverse rebel hardening his heart against all overtures of mercy, spurning the spirit of grace, habitually violating the law of love, abusing every good gift, blaspheming the gracious Father and the loving Son and the wooing Spirit, until grieved and quenched the flight is taken, the sinner is "left alone—joined to his idols," step by step becoming more and more demon-like until the mere presence of purity would be intolerable punishment to him, and so he goes "to his own place," "prepared for the devil and his angels."

The operation of the law of love in this direction is not wholly incomprehensible to him who realizes love abounding in his own being and in everything concerning himself and his. To him it appears inevitable that those who have become so utterly wretched by their own wilful perverseness as necessarily to exclude themselves from all good and environ themselves with all evil, should progressively and eternally tend downward in the bottomless pit of wailing woe. Therefore he desires no modification of the to him highly satisfactory doctrines of the atonement, eschatology, etc., as held by the fathers—he prefers theology that is not "progressive" to the exclusion of these great truths so clearly revealed to him as he reads the book of books.

Faith—"the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen"—buoys up its enlightened possessor into a hope that "putteth not to shame," until love permeates his whole being to such a degree that he can say from his own conscious experience, "now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love." For now he knows clearly that God does not exercise faith, because to him all things are known, and that God does not hope, for to him all things are present, but that God is merciful, gracious, kind, long-suffering, true, holy, nay further, that God *loves*, yea more, that GOD IS LOVE. In this abiding consciousness his reason becomes clarified and with unbroken chain of soundest logic he indisputably proves

his "*Rational Theism.*" His faith strengthened, broadened, deepened, leads him into an elevated, living hope with joy unspeakable and love indefinable enabling him to realize, with a fullness and richness of meaning too great for expression, that, indeed, he is a "new creature" in Christ.

And now, in this vital union with the foundation of wisdom, he does not stop to philosophize analytically about reason and faith, trying to ascertain where the one ends and the other begins, but rather, with truer philosophy unites the two and, using all his talents blending them in love, he apprehends time as not ceasing but merging into eternity, while in the all-penetrating light of this blessed union with the way and the truth and the life, "the vastness of the universe," "the unity and continuity of being," "universal law," etc., appear surely comprehended in the all-inclusive and "all-conclusive generalization:" "GOD IS LOVE." With overflowing soul he can join his Saviour in the joyous, incomparable exclamation of praise: "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes; yea, Father, for (that) so it was well-pleasing in thy sight." (Mat. 11 : 25, 26. Luke 10 : 21.)

The late Pastor Ahlfeld, of Halle, afterwards of Leipzig, once wrote underneath a picture of himself: "Ein Tröpflein Leben ist besser den ein Meer voll Wissen; das Wissen geht um Christus herum; das Leben senket sich in Ihn hinein." If the author of "*Pater Mundi*" had embodied this conception in his chapter on "Theism as a Scientific Hypothesis," and indeed in all his admirable works, his already irrefutable arguments might have become yet far more convincing, touching and commendable.

The trustful, childlike Christian, like Mary at the feet of Jesus and like John with his head upon the Master's breast, enjoying the life "hid with Christ in God," having the "mind in him that was in Christ Jesus," at one with his God, the Father and the Son "supping" with him and he with them, through the ministration of the Holy Spirit in most intimate and holy companionship, drinks in the divine consolations of peace, satisfac-

tion, joy, wisdom, that illuminate his way with indescribable brightness and that confer upon him a real foretaste of Heaven while he "walks with God on earth." No rolling billows on the stormy ocean of life can appall him while his "Father is at the helm"—in every threatening hour he hears the quiet, "Peace, be still." Though the world frown and rob him, contentment and abundance are his portion for he is a child and heir of the Father who possesseth all things. He "who rideth upon the wings of the wind and maketh the clouds his chariot" upholdeth him by day, by night, in adversity and prosperity, at home, abroad, alone, in the multitude, opening his understanding that he may comprehend, apprehend and appropriate eternal truth from the wonders and completeness of nature and from the varied experiences of earth-life as preëminently elucidated by the constant and faithful application of all-embracing revelation.

This suffices. Men may most skillfully use the microscopes and the telescopes of greatest known power to confound him, may differentiate, refine, speculate, may "advance" in thought, in discovery, in science and theology, may deal with infinitesimals and magnitudes, with invisibilities and materialities, with shadows and substances, may soar through illimitable space and measure bewildering distances, may theorize, philosophize and dogmatize to the utmost limit of their most expanded capacities, yet, unmoved, not disconcerted in the least, exhilarated with a better knowledge, exalted with a higher wisdom, standing on the Rock of Ages, radiant with light streaming from above, the true Christian, one with Christ, is at the source and has the key that will freely open all mysteries in ineffable glory. Already he knows beyond a peradventure that everything great and small in time and eternity is included and sufficiently explained in the three times three letters forming three monosyllables, in the present popular language of the globe, words of wondrous, of transcendental meaning: "God is love."

Discussion, investigation, advance in true science, proper application of real scientific import, may well be gladly hailed by the child of God, for, by passing through these test crucibles, error is sure to be eliminated sooner or later, and truth will shine

brighter and clearer because of these cleansing processes through which it can ever pass unscathed. He fears nought who knows that his trust is well-founded. Others may tremble at imaginations and fancies and phantoms conjured up out of nonentities, whilst he firmly stands as a monument of grace with beacon light guiding the benighted wanderer safely into the haven of rest. Reflecting the light that comes to him from the Sun of Righteousness he sheds abroad, in the darkness of a sinful world, the rays of hope in which his fellow creatures may find and rejoice in the creator of all. As dispenser of good to others he learns that the estate of which he has become sure possessor, instead of diminishing as the recipients multiply, on the contrary, indefinitely augments in proportion as the numbers increase. The religious element in man, which so greatly nonpluses the world-philosophers of to-day and whieh they seek in vain to explain away, is to him the very elixir of life, in it he sees the quintessence of light. Come what may he is content knowing that "to them that love God all things work together for good."

Even death, "the grim monster" to the worldly-minded, comes to the follower of Jesus as a welcome messenger calling the child of trust to the bosom of love in the home of the blessed. For when the Christian departs this life he does not die—it is death that dies—the Christian triumphs in glorious victory and "death no more hath dominion over him." The elder brother has removed all obstacles out of the way, has smoothed its roughnesses and has hallowed it with his blood so that it may not be mistaken. "The valley of the shadow of death" is illuminated with his loving presence and as the victor closes his bodily eyes on the helpers and loved ones of earth the portals of eternal day open wide and no powers of evil can shut them against him. He enters into glory "and he shall go out thence no more." There he enjoys forever the full fruition, the perfect consummation of heavenly bliss, the supreme and unclouded reign of the universal, unchangeable law, "God is love."

This implicit child-trust as a life-habit in the sojourner upon earth is never disappointed by the beneficent and benevolent and loving Father who never causes his child to shed a needless

tear—on the contrary, it is ever met and honored in the wisest and best way possible for the then condition of the recipient of his blessings, which are often better than he is able to ask or think. Ofttimes, who can tell how frequently, the plans of the child are frustrated, his requests denied, his purposes thwarted, for by so doing infinite wisdom and perfect love may bring about the accomplishment of his greatest good.

The thorns and thistles of earth are the result of the curse that sin brought into the world, but he who gave himself as a ransom for sinners wore the thorns as a crown upon his sacred head, removing the curse for all who come into and abide in his love. He who took the sting out of death, overcoming the monster, is the same whom the wrath of man shall surely praise and who shall restrain the remainder of wrath, the same who, wielding almighty power with perfect love, also over-rules all evil, even sometimes our most cherished desires, for the highest well-being in time and eternity of his own confiding sisters and mother, brothers and children.

The whole family of God,—precious thought,—some on earth, some passing over Jordan, some in the heavenly paradise, constitutes the blessed circle in which is "the communion of saints," "the life everlasting," in the riches of "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God and the communion of the Holy Ghost." This love will at last bring all home wearing victors' crowns with soul-diadems, to dwell together throughout the ceaseless ages in the many mansions in the Father's house on high, the house of the soul, bearing everlasting testimony in accordance with the law: "God is love."

The great First Cause, creator, preserver, bountiful benefactor, almighty, omniscient, omnipresent, friend, companion, husband, brother, sanctifier, "wonderful, counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of peace—of the increase of whose government and peace there shall be no end" (Isa. 9 : 6, 7)—"*He* healeth the broken in heart, and bindeth up their wounds. He telleth the number of the stars; he calleth them all by their names." "Who covereth the heaven with clouds, who prepareth rain for the earth, who maketh grass to grow upon the mountains—He giveth to the beast his food, and to

the young ravens which cry," (Ps. 147 : 3, 4, 8, 9.) In whose sight not a sparrow is forgotten, who has said, "the very hairs of your head are all numbered," (Matt. 10 : 30; Luke 12 : 7.) He cares for the very smallest of the least as well as for the very greatest of the mightiest. Verily, "the Lord our God, the Lord is one—and there is none other but he." (Mark 12 : 30, 33).

The devout student of history may distinctly trace his loving hand in everything concerning the church he has established and protected and spread over the earth, and within which he has placed the particular means of grace and wherein the holy sacraments are administered by ordained servants, whom he has specially called to the sacred service of their holy office—the church that has ever celebrated the love of God, and can not cease to sing his praise in grandest psalmody and purest hymnology and sublimest chorals known to men. Can the most learned of the worldly-wise account for this and these from a skeptical standpoint? What would or could they substitute for the Christian religion and the Church's inspiring hallelujahs? Surely "God is in the midst of her."

"God is love" was the key-note of the song of creation. The waters, the earth and the air teeming with newly begun life, creatures terrestrial, subterranean and submarine, joining in unmarred unison with the skies, harmonizing with the music of the spheres, combined as with one voice in swelling the chorus from grandeur unto sublimity "when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." (Job 38 : 7.)

"God is love" is the key-note of the song of redemption. This is the secret of the music of the sweet voice of the babe of Bethlehem, charming the ears and enrapturing the hearts of Mary and Joseph, of friends and strangers, of the angel-directed shepherds of the country, of the star-guided wise men of the east who worshiped, presenting precious gifts, delighting the soul of every regenerated mortal from the beginning to the end of time, until all respond in ecstatic, soul-stirring melody to the heaven-chorus heard on earth, softly echoing and reëchoing the sacred theme with "a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased." (Luke 2 : 13, 14)

"God is love" shall forever be the key-note of the songs in the state of glorification. When the heavens will have passed away with a great noise, and the elements, the heavenly bodies, will have been dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein will have been burned up and the new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness shall have appeared (2 Pet. 3 : 10, ff.)—when the innumerable multitude who have "washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," in glorified condition, unite, in perfect anthems of praise, with the heavenly hosts, singing "the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, great and marvelous are thy works, O Lord God, the Almighty; righteous and true are thy ways, thou King of the ages. Who shall not fear, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy; for all the nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy righteous acts have been made manifest" (Rev. 15 : 3, 4) then and forevermore, we believe, the glorious throng will chant the melody and swell the chorus and, in holy unison, with increasing power and perfectly sanctified spirit, will echo and reecho again and again, softer and more softly, louder and louder, stronger and higher and deeper and more sublime, the song of creation, of preservation, of redemption, of glorification, through the ages of ages of eternity, saying, "Worthy art thou, our Lord and our God, to receive the glory and the honor and the power: for thou didst create all things, and because of thy will they were, and were created." (Rev. 4 : 11.) "Worthy is the Lamb that hath been slain to receive the power, and riches, and wisdom, and might, and honor, and glory, and blessing." (Rev. 5 : 12, 13.) "Unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, be the blessing and the honor, and the glory, and the dominion for ever and ever."

# ARTICLE VI.

## THE PRESENCE OF JUDAS AT THE SUPPER.

By Rev. P. Anstadt, A. M., Ed. *Teachers' Journal*, York, Pa.

Very little is known of the history of Judas Iscariot previous to his call to the apostleship. He is called Judas Iscariot, most probably, from the name of his birth-place, and to distinguish him from Judas, the brother of James. His name always occurs in the gospels at the bottom of the list of the apostles, coupled with the remark, "which also betrayed him."

The prevailing belief in modern times, both among the clergy and the laity, is, that Judas was present at the institution of the Lord's Supper, and partook of it in common with the other apostles. We see this opinion presented not only in literature, but also in art, as, for instance, in that celebrated painting of the Lord's Supper by Leonardo da Vinci, where Judas appears as a conspicuous figure at the table. This painting has been copied and engraved and printed by the hundreds of thousands and can be found in nearly all of the illustrated Bibles. The principal reason for this almost universal belief in the presence of Judas at the institution of the Holy Sacrament is, that most persons do not make the proper distinction between the eating of the Jewish Passover and the institution of the Lord's Supper, which both took place in the same night, in the same upper room, and in immediate succession. They were, however, two distinct transactions, occurring not simultaneously, but one after the other. The Passover was celebrated, or eaten, first, the Lord's Supper was instituted afterwards. At the former Judas was undoubtedly present, from the latter he was absent, having left the hall just before Jesus began to institute the Holy Communion, as we think can be clearly shown by the record of the transaction in the gospels.

This subject was discussed already in the early ages of the Church with conflicting views. We will state the arguments

first on the affirmative and then on the negative side of the question.

I. Those who maintain that Judas was present, assert that the Lord's Supper was instituted immediately after the feet washing, and therefore the revelation of the betrayer must be placed after the institution of the Eucharist. From this it must follow that Judas was present as a communicant. Of this view are the old Church Fathers, Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, Baronius, Leo, Augustine, Beda, Rabana, Barnhart, and the Papists, Bellarmine, Jansonius, Baronius, Pierius and Maldonatus. Of the Reformed, Calvin, Beza, Martyr, Bucer and Whitaker are named by *Brandt.*

Their arguments from the Scriptures are as follows: Luke says, immediately after the institution: "The hand of my betrayer is with me on the table," from which it is clear that Judas was still in the guest chamber, when the Lord instituted the Eucharist. Then, if Judas was at the table, he must also have received the Lord's Supper, for Jesus says, "Drink ye all of this," and they all drank.

Count Zinzendorf, the founder of the society of the *Unitas Fratres*, commonly called Moravians, says in his work, *Jeremiah*, republished in 1830, page 231: "It is a truth as clear as the sun, that Judas participated in the Lord's Supper."

The Protestant Episcopal Church (Church of England) also assumes the presence of the traitor. Says an Episcopal writer, "St. Luke is generally more careful to set forth in order what he relates. And in the present case St. Luke's order is of special significance, since it implies that the traitor was present and partook in the sacramental rite."

The same writer continues: "Our Church plainly adopts the most ancient view, in the first exhortation in the giving of the Holy Communion, in which impenitent persons are warned not to come to the holy table, 'lest after taking of the holy sacrament the devil enter into you, as he entered into Judas, and fill you full of all iniquity, and bring you to destruction both of body and of soul.' "

In the seventeenth century the Lutherans mostly contended for the presence of Judas, and the Reformed for his absence,

because the former regarded it as an argument in favor of the dogma, that the unworthy also receive the real body and blood in the Eucharist, (this is the reason assigned in the Formula Concordiae), while the Reformed contended for his absence in support of the view, that the unworthy receive only bread and wine. It must be admitted, however, that neither party can gain much by proving the one side or the other of the question in dispute. Neither the presence or absence of Judas could prove dogmatically that he received anything celestial in the holy ordinance.* Of modern theologians Brandt enumerates Bachman, Rudelbach and Jaspis as deciding for the presence of Judas. The last named has published a sermon with the theme, *Judas the first unworthy communicant*, and gives his awful end as a fearful warning to all unworthy communicants. Their arguments are briefly these: Whilst not one of the evangelists speaks decisively of the withdrawing of Judas before the institution of the Lord's Supper, Luke (22 : 11, 12) speaks decidedly of the institution of the Supper before the departure of the betrayer. To this it is added, that in the participation of Judas in the Eucharist we have a more striking prediction of subsequent, oft repeated, and still occurring unworthy participation in the Holy Supper among those who profess faith in Christ.—*Brandt.*

Another argument, reasoning *a priori*, runs in this wise: "The Lord's Supper is a representation of the most intimate communion of the Christian with his redeemer; by admitting that Judas participated in the first Lord's Supper, we see how one who stood in the most intimate communion with Christ, may

*In quite recent times the question has assumed a new interest among a certain class of our Lutheran brethren. At one of the synods or conferences belonging to the General Council they were discussing the so-called Galesburg Rule, which excludes all non-Lutherans from Lutheran altars at the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. While the ministers were strenuously insisting that those who do not believe the doctrine of the real presence as taught in our Symbolical Books are not worthy communicants, and should be excluded from Lutheran altars, a layman startled them with the question, whether Judas was a worthy communicant, who, according to the Formula Concordiæ, was admitted to the Holy Communion by Christ himself?

fall from that communion." Such an argument might be admitted by an Arminian, but would weigh nothing with a Calvinist. Besides, Judas had agreed with the chief priests for thirty pieces of silver to betray Jesus into their hands, before the Passover, and therefore had already fallen from communion with Christ when he met him at the table.

But what is regarded as one of the strangest arguments on the affirmative side is this: "Every proper means must have been employed to bring Judas back from his traitorous and dreadful purpose. But the withholding of the Holy Communion would have deprived him of the greatest and most powerful means of grace, and thereby have given room to the presumption, that if he had participated in the sacrament, he would have been so deeply affected that he would possibly not have betrayed the Lord. But when we admit that he was present and participated, we see that the most powerful means of grace were unavailing in his case; he was lost beyond the reach of grace; he was the child of perdition."

II. Those who uphold the negative side of the question and contend that Judas was absent at the institution of the Lord's Supper base their argument mainly on John 13 : 30, and maintain that Judas had left the guest-chamber before the Eucharist was instituted, and never came back, and consequently could not have partaken of it. Of this view are Patianus and Ammonius; also the Papists, Turianus, Barradius, Salmeron, and many of the Reformed, and Calvinists, who use it as an argument that the unworthy communicants do not receive the real body and blood of Christ.

Of modern theologians Brandt, Olshausen, Tholuck, Julius Mueller, Ebrard, Kahnis, Meyer and Krummacher have decided in favor of the absence of the traitor. Their arguments are in substance as follows: Dr. Julius Mueller in *Herzog's Encyclopedia* says:

"According to the account of Luke (22 : 21) Judas was present. But if we compare the account of John, according to which he withdrew immediately after he had received the *sop* that designated him as the traitor, with the account of Matthew according to which Judas received the sop before the institution

of the Lord's Supper, then he cannot have been present at it. This certain combination between Matthew and John (two inspired eyewitnesses) must weigh heavier in a critical decision, than the passage which is given in Luke in an isolated expression of Jesus."

Ebrard and Kahnis are the two principal theologians who have written exhaustively on the Lord's Supper; each wrote a large book of about 600 pages; Ebrard from the Reformed, Kahnis from the Lutheran standpoint. Both, however, have decided against the presence of Judas at the Eucharist. The following is the substance of Kahnis:

"We have every reason to regard the supper of which John speaks as identical with the supper at which Jesus instituted the Holy Communion. When John says, that Judas, immediately after he received the sop went out, then he must have departed before the consecration of the cup, which we must regard as in immediate connection with the consecration of the bread, and consequently before the institution of the sacrament. Who would venture to assert, that Judas had received the sacrament only in one kind and not in the other?"

"Carefully considered, the words of the institution also speak against the presence of Judas. When Paul and Luke at the giving of the bread add, 'broken for *you*,' and at the giving of the cup Luke adds 'shed for *you*,' it might even stand thus, 'for *you*,' meaning all mankind—yet not in this case, if we do not wish to rob the words of Matthew and Mark of all weight, when they add, '*for many*.' The words '*for you*,' says Luther, require truly believing hearts. Judas certainly had anything but such a believing heart, and in his presence and to him Jesus could not have said these words."

Winer in his *Real-Woerterbuch* argues, that from psychological grounds Jesus must have desired the absence of the traitor from that solemn ordinance in which he could have had no heart and no part.

In weighing these arguments carefully it seems to us, the preponderance is largely on the side of the negative. The affirmative bases its argument on the words of Luke, which occur after the account of the institution of the Supper, and then

assumes that Luke related the events in consecutive order. (The two *apriori* arguments we do not regard as of much weight). If we assume that Luke related the events in consecutive order, then we must believe that Judas was present, which contradicts Matthew and John, according to whom he departed before the institution of the Supper. Then we would have to admit that either Luke was in error, or Matthew and John—both accounts could not be right—there must then be a contradiction—we would be driven to the alternative of preferring the testimony of two inspired witnesses to that of one only.

But we must not, and need not be driven to this alternative respecting the inspired writers. It is not at all necessary to believe that Luke gave the events in consecutive order. Luke in this part of the gospel is very brief, and appears to have compressed the principal points into a very narrow compass, and in this case evidently without regard to the succession of time, as is the case in some other parts of the Gospels.

But we assume that Matthew and John did relate the events of the last evening of Christ with his disciples before his crucifixion consecutively, and according to their account Judas departed before the institution of the Eucharist. This will appear plainly when we read the account in Matthew and combine John's account with it at the proper place.

According to Newcome's *Harmony*, the following order shows the successive stages of the exposure of Judas by Jesus, after which the traitor departed:

| Harmony. | Matt. xxvi. | Mark xiv. | Luke xxii. | John xiii. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Jesus indicates that it shall be one of them. . . . . | 21 | 18 | 21 | 21 |
| 2. Answering their inquiries, he indicates that it is one near him, dipping into the same dish. . . . . | 22–24 | 19–21 | 22–24 | 22 |
| 3. To John, in a low voice, he declares that the betrayer is the one to whom he shall give the *sop*, gives it to Judas. | ..... | ..... | ..... | 23–27 |
| 4. Satan possesses Judas, and Jesus bids him do quickly. None but John yet knows the exact *one*. . . . . | ..... | ..... | ..... | 28–29 |
| 5. Judas at last asks, *Is it I?* and Jesus before them all declares that *it is he*. | 25 | | | |

No one who compares the order of the two Evangelists, Matthew and Mark with John (13 : 21, 30) can well avoid the conclusion that Judas left the table on his dark and traitorous errand before the Lord's Supper was established. It seems certain that it was the purpose of our Lord to get rid of the presence of the traitor before the ordinance of the Supper was administered to his true-hearted disciples. Hence his warning, (John 13 : 10, 18, 27.) "Ye are clean, but not all." "He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me." "That thou doest do quickly."

Matthew and Mark both represent the exposure of the betrayer as taking place while they were eating the Passover, and before the institution of the Lord's Supper. Matthew's account reads as follows: "Now when evening was come, he sat down with the twelve. And as they did eat (the Passover) he said, verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they began to be exceedingly sorrowful, and began every one of them to say, Lord, is it I? And he answered and said: He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. * * Then Judas said, Master, is it I? He said unto him, thou hast said." (Matt. 26 : 20, 25.) Here John's gospel comes in: "And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simeon. And after the sop

Satan entered into him. Then said Jesus, that thou doest, do quickly. * * He then having received the sop, went immediately out and it was night."

Now, we take up again the account in Matthew, where we left off to insert the above extract from John. It is the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper after Judas had received the sop and departed. "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, take, eat, this is my body," etc.

This proves conclusively the departure of Judas before the institution of the Lord's Supper.

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### THE PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY IN INDIA.

By Rev. J. Nichols, Missionary of Eng. Lutheran Church of America, Guntur, India.

A country of 1,500,000 square miles in area, equal to all Europe except Russia, with a population estimated at 250,000,000, and under the government of the most enlightened, progressive, and best established nation of Europe, possesses no small interest. "The inhabitants of India," says a writer, "are a most singular people who were well fed and well clad, who had a written language and composed metaphysical treatises when the forefathers of the race that now bears sway over nearly 300,000,000 of them were still wandering in the woods of Britain and Germany, all of them savage and some perhaps cannibals."

India like Egypt, Greece, and Rome, has had her great historic epochs. Perhaps her most antiquitous period, were its history known, would prove itself the brightest. Her fabulous era we know is as interesting as that of Greece. Legends abound in her most ancient literature concerning her earliest inhabitants, equal in wealth and imagery to those related by Homer and Herodotus.

As is only too well known, India has had also her "Dark Age" whose slowly receding darkness is yet visible. The beginning

of this age of superstition is indefinable. But with the receding night India too with the whole world is

"Slowly rolling
Out of darkness into light,"

so that she may be truly said to have also a modern history, short though it be, with the promise of a glorious future, for her "golden age," like that of the Jews, is yet to come.

Not without interest is the history of India's frequent invasions, and the successive efforts made by her natives to exterminate the foreign intruders, besides the many civil wars that retarded the progress of her peculiar civilization. The most noted of the early invaders were the Greeks who under Alexander the Great marched as far as beyond the Indus in northern India, as early as 327 B. C. But the discontent of his troops forced him back without effecting more than a nominal conquest.

In the middle of the 7th century the Mohammedans made their first invasion. In this they were repelled and defeated. Their attacks were, however, renewed from time to time until Sultan Mamud and fourteen of his descendants ruled India more than two hundred years. They exerted so powerful an influence over the natives that many of their customs, as well as their faith, were adopted, and to day it is estimated that 22 per cent. of all the inhabitants of India are Mohammedans.

The distinctly modern history of India may be said to date from the beginning of the 17th century, when the East India Company was first organized and England began her gradual acquisitions and conquests. About the same time that Sir Walter Raleigh attempted to establish a colony in America, the first English merchant fleet of four vessels, under the auspices of the East India Company, left Plymouth for India under the command of Capt. Jas. Lancaster. "Few great things," says a historian, "have had a smaller beginning than that stupendous anomaly the British Empire in India." About the middle of the 18th century, after Aurungzebe's and his successors' repeated failures in their attempts at restoring peace, at a time when the whole land was distracted by civil wars, when ruin everywhere marked a once wealthy country, then it was, amidst

the dissolution and dismemberment of a once mighty dominion, that Great Britain began to lay the sure and solid foundation of her Eastern empire, and this she did so gradually, although by no means without formidable oppositions at times, that to-day her power here is all but absolute.

The chief characteristic of a nation (for I shall speak of India as a nation under the government of another nation) is its individuality. India has her distinctive features, which are most apparent in her civil and domestic customs. Her art, literature, and philosophy, if philosophy she may be said to possess, and most of all, her religious customs, are each peculiar. It is true, India has furnished the world no philosopher, poet, sculptor or artist of the first rank, yet as early as 500 years B. C. it is said Pythagoras and others came here from Greece to study the philosophy, science, literature, and art of these eastern Aryans. It is, however, generally admitted that the oriental mind is *per se* not naturally adapted to the development of a reliable philosophic system. True philosophy could not originate among a people so overawed by the forces of nature as the Hindus are. To a western mind the fanciful so-called philosophic speculations of the Brahmins with respect to being as such, seem ridiculously absurd. One reason why philosophy could not originate in this cradle of the human race, is not because of insusceptibility of high culture on the part of the natives, but because of their state of utter passivity. "The Hindu," as Prof. Ueberweg most truthfully says, "lacks in the tendency to strict demonstration." They do not possess that love of the truth for its own sake, that is necessary to the development of a sound philosophy.

As for literature the Sanscrit literature in its mythology is not unlike the Greek. India has also her Lucian in an ancient Tamil poet whose pen was as severe upon the immoralities of their gods and goddesses as was that of Plato with reference to Homer's deities. The most famous Hindu poems, the Mahabarata, a Sanscrit epic of 100,000 verses, and the Ramayana, compare favorably with the best of other literatures. Both these poems were well known in India in the second century before the Christian era.

It is not, however, the literature, the art, nor the so-called philosophy, nor yet the civil institutions of India, which we wish to notice, except so far as they may aid us in forming an adequate conception of India's present state. What is worthy of notice more particularly are a few facts and thoughts for reflection upon the somewhat general yet important subject, *The Progress of Christianity in India.*

India has from time all but immemorial been the scene of Christian missionary labor. If we may credit Neander and other church historians no less authoritative, we may safely give the story of St. Thomas' labors in India at least the honor of probability. It is one of the most interesting facts in mediæval history that when the ambassadors of Alfred the Great came to Malabar in the 9th century, they found to their astonishment a well established church with a large membership who acknowledged St. Thomas, the apostle, to be its founder, and Mr. Jas. Grant in his admirable history of India says, "In the beginning of the 13th century Marco Palo was shown the spot where St. Thomas was said to have suffered martyrdom. The spot was visited by pilgrims from Christendom while the Mussulmans themselves revered the apostle as a holy man." Obscure and mythical as these early accounts may appear in detail, distorted no doubt by Roman Catholic credulity, it must be admitted that there are traces of an early time when Christ was welcomed in India. On the walls of the Buddhist temple at Kandy in the isle of Ceylon there is a picture of a fiery hell in which the chief figure is one of benign countenance nailed to the cross. Those who have examined this picture carefully are of the opinion that although the cross is planted in the midst of hell, it does not indicate that he who was suspended upon it is there for punishment, but from the prostrate sufferers who kneel to him around the foot of the cross, with clasped hands, as if he had descended for their deliverance, it indicates most forcibly that he was there on a mission of mercy. If the origin of this picture could be traced it might reasonably be found associated with the apostolate of Christ's earliest disciples.

But however behind the cloud the story of St. Thomas' labor

in India may be, the missionary of whom we know more and who was fully equal to St. Thomas in natural endowments, though officially subordinate, is St. Francis Xavier, who may well be styled India's second apostle. Actuated by an inextinguishable zeal the well-known Jesuit left Portugal April 1541 and arrived at Goa in May of the year following. His friends tried hard to dissuade him from the undertaking, urging among other things the unhealthiness of the climate, the sterility of the soil, and the barbarity of the natives. His reply to these objections is well worthy of imitation, disclosing the Christian motive that actuated him to this noble undertaking at a time when commerce had not yet extended to that then little known land. "The nations that are tractable and opulent will never want for teachers," said he, "but this mission," referring to India, "is for me, because others are not disposed to undertake it. If the country abounded in odoriferous woods, and mines of gold all danger would be braved to procure them. Should merchants then be more intrepid than missionaries? Shall these unfortunate people be kept in ignorance of the blessings of redemption? Should I be instrumental in the salvation of but one individual among them I should consider myself amply recompensed for all the danger and privations by which you endeavor to terrify me." These were noble sentiments from a noble soul. Well may St. Francis Xavier's remains rest in peace at Goa for his works do follow after him.

Though the Church of Rome has the preëminence in antiquity in missionary operations in India, and a numerical superiority, yet are we more specially interested in the progress of the more recent Protestant mission work in India. This to us is more interesting because far more successful at present than the work of the Roman Catholics, as Dr. Christlieb conclusively shows in a recent essay on *The Present State of the Foreign Missions of Protestantism.*

The first prominent Protestant missionary to India, not to mention Ziegenbalg and others, was Rev. Christian Frederick Schwartz. His immediate influence in converting Arunàsalem, a high caste Hindu of great learning and wealth, was not alone encouraging to himself, but resulted in bringing many under the

influence of the Gospel who otherwise would never have been reached. It was about the year 1760 when he began his labors in Cuddalore, in the south of India. His name and fame as a missionary soon became universally known. Nor is he forgotten in the land itself where he labored so disinterestedly for the benighted.

Three years after the birth of our immortal Bryant, the father of American poetry, Schwartz in a good old age, took his departure from earth and its labors, universally revered. It was during Schwartz's time that the charter of the East India Company which had been first granted the last day of Dec. 1599, right on the verge of the eventful 17th century, was renewed. It is a notable fact and creditable to the English government, that as early as 1698 the East India Company was bound by its charter to maintain a chaplain and school-master in every garrison and superior factory, and to set apart a proper place for the performance of divine worship. They were also obliged to have a chaplain for every vessel of 500 tons, whose salary was to commence with the voyage of the ship and who was to be approved of by the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of London. But strange to say, about a hundred years after this, in 1795, near the close of Schwartz's eventful life, the East India Company actually adopted the policy of excluding missionaries altogether from their territories. "As these restrictions existed until about the beginning of the present century," says a historian, "religious progress was necessarily slow; and in 1813, during the debates upon the new charter, when much was said respecting the progress of Christianity, nearly every man who lived in India was bitterly opposed to the appointment of missionaries to be salaried by the state." Of course this had nothing to do with individual and denominational efforts. Nevertheless the folly of such a policy soon became apparent and the time had come when it was deemed expedient that India should have a regular and well appointed hierarchy, headed by prelates of the Anglican Church, and in the latest charter a provision was made for "the maintenance and support of a church establishment in the East Indies." But the validity of this last charter granted to the East India Company was of short duration.

Disraeli offered resolutions in the British Parliament for a change of government in India, which after a thorough discussion, were embodied in a Bill entitled *An Act for the better Government of India*, which became a law on the 2d of Aug. 1858. There are less than eighty-five sections in this Act, which transferred over 200 millions of subjects of the East India Company to the Sovereign Queen. It enacts that India shall be governed by, and in the name of Her Majesty, through one of her principal Secretaries of State, assisted by a Board composed of fifteen members, to be styled the Council of India. On the 1st of Sept. 1858, the famous old East India Company was dissolved. It was incorporated by Queen Elizabeth in 1600 as previously stated, but the political existence of it is chiefly to be dated from the terrible battle of Plassey in 1757. "There is no record in history," says Dr. Marshman, "of so brilliant a career, nor is there any instance of power so extensive and so rapidly acquired, with so few causes of regret on the score of political morality as that of the East India Company. Notwithstanding its errors and short-comings, it may be safely affirmed that no foreign dependency has ever been administered in a spirit of higher energy, or greater benevolence, or by a longer succession of great men. But its high mission was accomplished, and the anomaly of continuing the government of so vast a dominion with such an agency was daily becoming more obvious, and even without the dark crisis of the mutiny, the termination of its trust could not have been far distant."

This vast country over which Victoria now reigns as Empress, is divided into nine provinces which yield an average annual revenue of over fifty millions sterling. Schools have been organized throughout the empire, which though not always favorable to Christianity sometimes tend to its promotion indirectly. The work of the government and government schools is negative in promoting Christianity in India. The government tends to suppress the long established vices, the schools to bring them into disrepute. *But the active work of Christianizing India is left for the Christian Church to do and she is doing the work as efficiently as her present means permit her.* Earnest work is being carried on here now by thirty-eight Protestant missionary

societies. Eight of these societies are Lutheran,—two American, and six European. The number of ordained European and American missionaries is above six hundred. The parable of likening the kingdom of heaven to leaven applies most strikingly to India. Nor is the work confined to the native Hindus alone. It is also directed towards the more obstinate Mohammedans with a considerable degree of success. Many of the Mohammedans of Punjaub have become the very best Christians in northern India. According to Mr. Hughes, of Peshuwar, these converts from Islamism number over three hundred. Of these many are well known evangelists and some are ordained preachers. But in Calcutta, Madras and Bombay the conversion of a Mohammedan to Christianity is looked upon as a miracle. "Yet on account of the growing decay of its political influence," says Dr. Christlieb, "many cultivated Mohammedans are beginning to lose confidence in the future of Islamism, although from prudential considerations, they do not openly express their convictions."

A word in regard to our expectations and the results of missionary efforts may not be out of place here. We sometimes err by expecting too large returns in too short a time. When we remember that it is but a short time since England has had control over India, we may well rejoice at what Christianity has already accomplished here. Many of her abominable customs have already been abolished by law, during the comparatively short period since England has been in a civil position to exercise the right of suppressing these vicious practices.

What is peculiar in India mission work is that results are shown only after a long time of work, *e. g.* in the Telugu territory, at the Cuddapah station the London Society labored thirty years without making more than 200 converts. Then all at once there came a revival among the low caste population, and the 200 swelled into 11,000. So in South Mahratta, the Basel Lutheran missionaries thought at one time of retiring from the field when unexpectedly in a few years the number of converts rose to over a thousand. So of the Lutheran missions among the Kohls under the direction to the German Gossner Society. After waiting five years the first converts were baptized in 1850

and since then up to 1870, the number has increased to over 12,000. Says Christlieb, to whom I am indebted for some of these facts: "The increase of new converts which has taken place in India during the two years from 1878 to 1880 has been unparalleled in the history of missions." According to the most reliable statistics there were about 125,000 native Christians in India in 1850. The estimated number at present is considerably over a million.

The famine of 1876–8, convinced many of the natives of the utter helplessness of their gods, and the absolute superiority of Christianity in its sympathy and succor over their own selfishness. Besides it increased their confidence in the Christian missionaries. Numbers of them are reported as having said in substance, "Our own people did nothing for us and were it not for the generosity of Christians, more than half of us would have perished. Christians worship the true God and are in possession of the true religion, whereas our countrymen worship false gods and observe false religions." Mysterious are God's ways! Even calamities are his ministering servants, serving as practical agents to send the Gospel to their very hearts. It is a prominent fact, that in southern India where the missionaries exerted themselves most in relieving the sufferers, there have the greatest accessions been made to the Christian faith recently. This is especially noticeable in our own stations in the Kristua district. But the converts thus far have been from the lower grades of society. More than five-sixths are from the lower castes or outcastes. More attention should be bestowed upon the higher castes. Considering the nature of the Brahmin's deep-rooted customs, it is evident that India can never be won for Christ so long as the high caste are neglected. A low caste generally has no influence, except a derogatory one, upon a higher caste, but the influence of a high caste convert upon the low is paramount. It is true, caste distinctions should be discountenanced, but since they exist, they should be controlled for good by beginning to break them down from the top. Public education begins at the top and works upon the filtration principle. Teachers of the Christian faith should work upon the same principle. The most

interesting conversions as well as some of the most efficient workers are from the high caste Brahmins.

That Christianity is making progress in India is evident from the fact that caste, its most formidable obstacle, is fast disappearing. Hinduism like the Sintooism of Japan and China, is unsuited to the progress of modern social life, consequently caste is now shifting in its rules and must go. The very railways are factors in its abolishment. The schools, too, both the mission and the government schools, are contributing their influence towards undermining it. The English which is taught in these schools, bears with it a Christian literature, so that wherever it is spoken and taught, the seeds of Christianity are sown which must bring forth some fruit, for try as you will you cannot expunge Christianity from the English literature. Even skepticism which must speak of Christianity in order to oppose it, is in many instances made instrumental in promoting that which it tries to suppress.

That Christianity is making progress in India is also evident from the fact that many if not all of the immoral and derogatory practices of the Hindus are fast disappearing. Idol worship is being slighted in some quarters; the Suttee is abolished by law; infanticide is suppressed, and the right to remarry has been granted by the government to the Hindu widow. The present which may well be characterized India's transition period is indicative of a speedy abolition of all these vices, and most of all, of female slavery. The British government must be acknowledged to be the factor in bringing about these beneficent changes. We sometimes reprove this executive for not doing more, and for not being more severe. That there is just cause for complaint is evident, but let us rather look upon the opposite side and consider what the British government by the grace of God has done, that no other power could have done so effectually in so short a time.

To be informed by good authority that there are more persons in India friendly towards Christianity than missionary statistics would lead us to suppose, is another evidence of its progress. "There are many secret believers," says one who knows whereof he speaks, "who shrink from making an open confes-

sion and who on their deathbeds surprise the missionary by their faith in Christ."

That Christianity is making progress in India is evident from the fact that influential native Hindus themselves speak in its favor. Keshub Chunder Sen, though not altogether a Christian, did much towards preparing the way for it to the higher caste. He confessed years ago that, "The spirit of Christianity has already pervaded the whole atmosphere of Indian society, and we breathe, think, feel and move in a Christian atmosphere. Native society is being roused, enlightened, and reformed under the influence of Christianity!" Shortly before his death he crowned his testimony with this confession: "Our hearts are touched, conquered, overcome by a higher power, and this power is Christ. Christ, not the British government, rules India! No one but Christ has deserved the precious diadem of the Indian crown and will have it!" May these immortal words, uttered by one of India's own sons, reverberate from the ocean to the Himalayas.

That Christianity is making progress in India is evident from the success of our own mission here in Guntur and vicinity. The only hindrance to still greater success is the want of more men to occupy the field and sufficient means to support them comfortably and efficiently. But the good work is going forward, and the prophecy spoken long before Keshub Chunder Sen gave it utterance, that Christ will rule not only all India, but the whole world, is being realized.

Well may an American divine compare India to "the Sleeping Beauty," whose head is pillowed on the southern slope of the Himalaya mountains, jeweled with sparkling diamonds; whose feet lave the blue waters of the Indian Ocean. In her right hand she holds a gem—Bombay; in her left hand, a gem—Calcutta. Across her breast is a string of pearls—Patna, Benares, Allahabad, Jhansi, and Baroda. Beautiful beyond description is she, but she sleeps. Her priests laugh her Saviour to scorn who tells them she is not dead but sleeps. "Dead is she," they cry. "Dead for thousands of years." But Christ is standing at her side to-day, and calling to her: "Damsel, arise!" And she is waking from her long sleep in all her pristine beauty to greet him as her sovereign King and Saviour.

## ARTICLE VIII.

### LUTHER AS POET IN DAILY LIFE.

Translated from Dr. Freybe's "Luther in Sprache und Poesie," by REV. W. E. FISCHER, A. M., Centre Hall, Pa.

The weightier writings of Luther, as his letters, his fables written for his little son, his translation of the Bible in which he appears not only as an interpreter but as the interpreter of the German soul-life, the highest and most real poetry revealed by the grace of God, and last, but by no means the least, the daily life at home with his notes and joys, all these set Luther before us as the poet of daily life. What poesy breathes in Luther's wonderful letters from his Patmos, as he called the Wartburg in his relation to it in 1521, when for example he writes to Spalatin concerning a certain chase upon which he, between dogs and nets, was busy with his own thoughts. To him this was an illustration of the devil who by his snares and wicked servants, his dogs, chased the innocent little animals. "Through my interference," he writes, "we saved a little rabbit, and I had wrapped it in my coat sleeve and gone aside a little distance; in the meantime the dogs had scented out the poor rabbit and through my coat bitten its right leg in two and killed it. Just so the devil rages in order to again destroy rescued souls and render my pains useless." And from the castle at Coburg, his "Sinai," where he tarried during the imperial Diet at Augsburg, he writes to his fellow-boarders at Wittenberg concerning the "Imperial Diet of rooks and jackdaws," and how he was making a Zion of his Sinai and had built there three tabernacles, one for the Psalter, one for the Prophets and one for Aesop. Poetry seeks to interpret the earthly and common. To accomplish this, there is necessary, along with the forming gift, the plastic, which Luther possessed in high degree; above all things, a true, unbeclouded contemplation of the world with that poetic justice * * * which is an image of the divine, and in which the

little often appears great and the great little, and in which sin is at once judged and condemned as sin. It is precisely from this point of view that the child-like spirit appears as the truly poetic; appears too, for example, in our German Märchen, full of unfathomable, genuine poetry, and which is also not wanting in that enchanting, so-called poetic perspective. All true poetry is a mirror of the world and its life; it is able to represent and express world and life with that poetic justice in which, despite all troublesome confusion, there is no accident, and with the indestructible faith, that finally every contradiction will be cleared away and nothing left unnumbered—no, not even a hair of our heads. The world of man, of nature and of bliss, are not separate worlds or distinct from this poesy, but are to her an *organismus.* He who desires to become acquainted with this poetic and at the same time real contemplation of the world in Luther, must look upon him at home and at the table, as husband and father, at the birth of a child at Christmastide and at death, in short, in the joy and grief of the family, in garden and in field. The German home, at all times the proper seat of German poetry, became in Luther's home, thoroughly and most earnestly child-like, eminently poetic and at the same time, as it always should be, a place for a most real contemplation of the world. While in the common home the poetry of many a true poet lies dormant, in Luther, on the contrary, it awoke and displayed its true heavenly lustre and divine mission. He who can illustrate the home with all its music and business as Luther has done it is and will remain a poet for all time, even though he have not written a single rhyme. For who is a poet? He who knows how to unlock the depths of the human heart, to represent everything that stirs the human breast, life's greatest grief and highest joy; he, who in the changing scenes of this transient life finds the deepest seriousness and an eternal permanence real, and teaches that these are real, is, in Bilmar's judgment, a genuine poet for all ages. How well, for example, Luther knew how to represent the highest joy of life in holy wedlock when he says: "The greatest mercy and gift of God is to have a pious, joyful, God-fearing, frugal wife, with whom you live peaceably and to whom you can entrust all your possessions, yea, even your body

and life. Katie, you, like other pious wives, are an empress; recognize it and thank God. According to the word of God, the world has no more lovely and delightful treasure than holy wedlock, which God himself has ordained, preserves and has made honorable for all classes, and out of which, not only princes and kings and all saints, but even the Son of God was born, though in a different way. I praise, and will till death praise God for the holy state of matrimony." And this he did. How could Luther, to cite but one instance, more highly esteem the marriage relation than when he writes of the Epistle to the Galatians on this wise: "This is my epistle with which I am in love—it is my Catharine Von Bora." And how charming and replete with poetry are not Luther's letters to Katie, which he so happily closes with these words: "Your old Love," or, "Your old Lord." The deep, strong, German-family-and-home-feeling, which had long ago made our people above all other nations, a home people, lived in Luther, as always in our past, strengthened and deepened, by the word of God. How affectingly did it express itself when he lay sick unto death at Smalcald; how heartily he yearned after his family and home, after wife and child, saying: "No one is so spiritual that he does not experience such an innate longing and love; it is therefore a great thing." Thus spoke the selfsame man who with a bold renunciation sang:

> "Destroy they our life,
> Goods, fame, child and wife,
> Let all pass amain."

He looked upon children as God's greatest blessing. As Dr. Jonas on one occasion had hung over the table a branch of cherries in remembrance of the creation and praised God for the rich blessing in such fruits, Dr. Martin said: "Why does this not remind you much more of your children as the fruit of your loins, who are more surpassingly beautiful and glorious creatures of God than all the fruit of trees? In them we see God's omnipotence and skill, for he made them out of nothing, has given them, in one year, body, life and every member, fashioned so neatly, delicately and beautifully and will nourish and keep them." And again: "For them above all, one should sing a

*Deo Gratias* to the Lord. Children are the loveliest fruit and bond of marriage. They are the wool of the sheep." How often Luther learned innocence and simplicity from his children, —that in faith they were even more advanced than "we old fools." Children to him, lived artlessly simple, without offense or obstacle of reason in faith, as Ambrose says: "In reason there is deficiency, but not in faith." How Luther was a child to children is seen nowhere so strikingly as in his letter from Coburg to his little son Hans—a poetic masterpiece of genuine simplicity in prose. What a precious poesy is not that with which the paradisaical child-world is represented in the "beautiful merry garden"—a poesy by which one is led to think of Gœthe's language: 'Know that poetic words are always flitting about and gently tapping at the gate of paradise.' "Many children go into this beautiful garden, they wear coats adorned with gold, and are picking beautiful apples and pears from under the trees, also cherries and plums; they jump about, sing and are very happy, and they have such beautiful ponies with golden bridles and silver saddles. There are drums and fifes and lutes and all kinds of stringed instruments and the children dance and shoot with little cross-bows. There is a beautiful lawn in this garden prepared for dancing." Thus Luther pictured the child's paradise; and when he once said of children that they had such fine ideas of God, that he is their loving God and Father in heaven, this, from him, the earnest, warlike hero, is of a piece with the simple, and therefore, highly poetic child-mind. For simplicity is the mother of all popular poetry. Out of this unconscious poesy of simplicity, arose many a heart-refreshing word of Luther. As he once saw his little son Martin playing with his dog, he said: "This boy preaches God's word indeed, since God says: 'Have dominion over the fish of the sea and the beasts of the field,'—for the dog allows the little boy to do with him what he pleases." Once he took his child on his knee and it defiled him, upon which he remarked: "O how much murmuring and stench our Lord must endure from us, and different than the mother from her child." No one can say of Luther, the poet of daily life,—"His eyes scarcely rest on this world"—but *this* applies to him as to every genuine poet: "Often he en-

nobles that which to us appeared common, and that which is valuable, becomes as nothing." Many a thing, in itself common enough and very prosaic, became through him thoroughly poetic; this was true of the home, the garden and the field. His cherished servant, Wolfgang Sieberger, with whom in 1525 he had begun the trade of turning, he asked for seeds; "For," said he, "since Satan is raging with his hosts, I will laugh at him and will view and enjoy the gardens, (*i. e.* God's blessings), to his praise." Hence he could write to Spalatin: "If you come to see me you shall look upon some old reminders of our friendship and love. I have planted the garden and built the well, and both with success. Come to me, and you shall be crowned with lilies and roses." In the year 1534, Wolfgang had prepared a net to catch goldfinches. This called forth from Luther that poetic "Complaint of the Birds"—the complaint of "thrushes, robins, goldfinches, linnets, together with other pious and honorable birds who will have to pass over Wittenberg this Autumn. Given in our aerial abode under the trees, with our ordinary seal." The perishable is but a reflection or a comparison; this is particularly so to the true poet, who sees in the transitory, not *perhaps* the ideal, but the images of the divine prototype. So Luther viewed it. On the 11th of April, 1539, standing in his garden, he was thoughtfully regarding the trees as they were budding, blossoming and clothing themselves in green; he was deeply moved at the sight and said: "Blessed be God the Creator, who out of dead creatures, in the Springtime, brings all to life again; here we have a beautiful picture of the resurrection." And when once Luther's children stood around the table and eagerly eyed the fruit upon it, he said: "He who would see a picture of one who rejoices in hope, has in this sight, a perfect counterpart. O, that we might thus in joyful hope, regard the judgment day!" At another time Luther saw a little bird sitting upon a tree, and passing the night there, when he said: "This little bird has had its supper and would here securely sleep, giving itself no trouble, nor providing its breakfast and lodging, as David in Ps. 91 says: 'He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most high shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty,' so it sits upon its little twig contentedly and lets God provide."

Thus Luther stands forth as a poet in the midst of daily life, not only with German-family and natural emotion, but also with that intuition of the world of happiness and of nature, which is something quite different from the playing with arbitrary fancies. This intuitive poesy of the whole organism, is in contents and form the most real, not a playing of the thoughts, not the poesy of the drawing room, but the every day poesy of the home, the family, the field, the garden, equally comprehended by the great and the small, the educated and the uneducated, a very Mary, who sits at the feet of her Lord, and yet a Martha, who serves him in cellar, in house, yard, field and forest, in good and evil days, a companion on life's road of humiliation and exaltation, in pleasure and sport, clothed, as in mourning and lamentation, not in splendid dress with the long train of fashion, but in the simple, honorable, domestic garb of German simplicity. She speaks the simple language of the people, of the home, and interprets, though speaking without rhyme, the soberest prose, every possession and all earthly things, and thus accomplishes the highest that poetry in general is able to accomplish. In all things, Luther appears more richly endowed than most writers of rhyme with this sublime gift of God, a poetic intuition of the world of nature and of bliss ; more particularly is this true of him in his four "Pfählen.' His "Table Talk" is full of strong never-fading evidences of this—a true perennial fountain of rich imperishable German poetry. He belongs not to the learned masters who bury themselves in books and rarely look upon mountain and valley. His poetic images, have, next to those of the Holy Scriptures, a matchless value, and should be more and better studied. To him, the German man of God, all creation preached. Whilst to Zwingli, for example, (who in this indeed represented a large class of men) it was a foregone conclusion that earthly things could not possibly be the bearers of heavenly realities, the vehicle of divine grace, and that God worked only through the intellect upon the soul of man, we find in Luther exactly the opposite view of God and the world, that real contemplation, upon which rested alike his theology and his poetry, and in this reality, in final appeal, the very foundation from which arose his doctrine of the *real presence* in the Lord's Sup-

per. A real divine presence he saw everywhere. "Our home, yard, field, garden and everything is full of Bible." This sentiment, uttered already in his tender child-like, bold artlessness, betrays the true poet, to whom everything transitory is a likeness, the universe an image of the world of blessedness. "Christians speak with trees and everything that grows upon the earth, and these in turn speak with them." In these earthly things, God's work, which he will do for us, is depicted and the articles of faith are therein comprehended, as a precious jewel wrapped in a little cloth. What divine order is on earth is an image of his heavenly possessions; hence one may use such illustrations with great propriety. These too, one should bring before the masses; you can not teach them by the use of high, difficult, abstruse things, for they can not comprehend them. "Ah, how careful was our Lord to teach with simplicity. He found illustrations in yard, fold and forest. The use of illustration in writing or in speech serves the additional purpose of defense against the devil with his fiery darts, for he seeks to lead us away from the word by his high thoughts and subtle questions; and by the use of these light-bearing word-pictures, which even the ordinary man can grasp, we are kept in a proper understanding of the Word." "The Gospel," says Luther, "is so clear that it only needs to be considered well, looked into and taken deeply into the heart. And none will derive more benefit from the Gospel, than they who possess their hearts in peace, turn everything out and with diligence continue therein. Just as the sun very distinctly reflects himself in a still, calm stream of water, and warms it too, but on the contrary may not be seen in, nor warm a roaring running stream. So do, if thou be calm and dost earnestly grasp the image in thine heart, and thou shalt discover wonder upon wonder."

This is the self-same prerequisite which Goethe demands to a proper conception of poetry, when he says: "The successful man will be wanting in nothing if he accepts this gift with a calm spirit." This holy, Sabbath-like contemplation of God's word where God's spirit penetrates the deepest depth of the soul, is worth a thousand times more than all the expositions of eloquent and ready tongues. Only in

this way does God's word become the life-giving element of the soul. For "what pasture is to the cattle, a home to man, a nest to the bird, a rock to the chamois, and the stream to the fish, that is the Holy Scriptures to believing souls." And further: "Let your thinking and feeling go, and make much of the Bible as of the richest mine that can never be fathomed nor yet exhausted, in order that you may find therein the divine wisdom which God has so simply set forth in the Bible, that he might subdue and humble all learned pride, In this book you find the swaddling clothes and the manger, in which Christ lies, thither also the angel directs the shepherds. The swaddling clothes are indeed mean and simple enough, but precious is the treasure *Christ*, who is wrapped therein." Of the Bible Luther at another time said: "I have for a number of years read it through twice a year, and if it were a large, mighty tree and every word a little branch and twig, still, I have knocked at every bough and twig, and always shook and brought away some apples or pears." The temporal promises of the Holy Scriptures were to Luther like nuts and apples with which one allures the children—"for thus we too are lured and charmed by the temporal promises that we may love the enduring things and may nourish within us the hope of immortality."

One would suppose, because of the manifold cares, which were by no means wanting in Luther's family, that his poetic spirit would be suppressed. But that holy unconcern, born out of a strong, child-like and at the same time manly faith, ever preserved to him a cheerful heart, even though he had but once a day "a crust of bread and a herring." So far as temporal wants were concerned, the sparrow became a preacher and doctor for him and for the wisest—a doctor and preacher that sang God's praise and our shame (our little faith) to heaven. "Christians are to use with joy the creature, not trust to it nor fasten their affections upon it, but trust God, otherwise they will be poor with the greatest riches. Yea, this is the case with all the rich. If you could look into their hearts, you would surely say, 'None of this for me; I will gladly be without velvet and gold; I will gladly wear a gray coat and drink small beer—take a flail and thresh until I sweat. I can go to my field, can work and sing a

little hymn; when I come home I can relish a crust of bread when the very *best* is not relished by a king and a prince; I lie down and sleep a good spell, when great lords are doing nothing but weeping in their hearts. Gentlemen, wear your golden chains if you will." To the anxious wife, Luther writes: "Read John and the Smaller Catechism, for you want to provide for your God as though he were not omnipotent, a God who could create ten Doctor Martins, should this aged one perish in the Saale or in the furnace or in the decoy of the wolf. Do not disturb me with your anxious care, I have a better provider than you and all angels are. He lies in the manger, but for all that sits at the right hand of God the almighty Father." Yet he addressed her as "holy, careful wife," and "most holy lady doctress." Luther regarded holy unconcern and joyfulness as the best remedy against the "devil of melancholy." He once pledged a guest at his home in the following words: "I should and must be happy to-day, for I have heard bad news. Against this, nothing will stand me in better service than a sturdy *Pater Noster* and good courage; it vexes the devil of melancholy that one, under such circumstances, will still want to be happy." He once preached the following reproof sermon against "Little Faith and Despondency:" "I have recently seen two wonders —the first, when I saw out of my window the stars of heaven and the great and beautiful vault of God; but nowhere could I discover the pillars upon which the master had placed them; nevertheless the heavens fell not and this vault still stands firm. Well, there are some who are searching for the pillars and would fain lay hold of and examine them! And because they cannot do so, they shake with terror as though the heavens were certainly going to fall. If they could only grasp the pillars, then the heavens would be secure." Thus Luther, child-like, and unconsciously to himself, is everywhere really the richest poet of daily life, who beautifully stands forth in compass of matter, in variety of genius, in German soul-depth and biblical contemplation of the universe, just as in plastic figure a more significant and often more imposing prospective and more sensuous power stands forth beautifully. All his contemplation of the

universe, which found expression in just this sensuous power of his speech, must necessarily work impressively and lastingly upon his people. In this really poetic, heaven-inspired contemplation of the universe, in which, without fanaticism and with a strong body he stood upon the solid earth, he heard with an ear, finely attuned by God's word, "the harmony of nature;" what history offered, or life afforded, his bosom at *once* and *willingly* took up. His mind brought together the widely scattered, and his emotion animated the inanimate. Often he ennobles that which to us seemed common, and the esteemed, by his word, becomes nothing. Even the least feature in every genuine poem, is also in him one of the most unmistakable and important. As he praised, above every beautiful flower of earth, the precious grain that was without splendid form, but stands in the field clothed only in a pale yellow, so his genius is busy everywhere upon the healthy, the lasting, the eternal; and thus, like a genuine poet, he ennobles that which to us appeared common, whether in preaching to his people the word of life, or in being shaved. He could not for example, more impressively illustrate, even in sermon, original sin, than when in Eisleben as he was being shaved and having his hair cut he said to Dr. Jonas: "Original sin in us, is just like a man's beard; though you shave it off today, so that you look quite smooth about the mouth, still by the morrow it is grown again. And such growing of the hair and the beard will not cease while life lasts; only when the grave closes over us, will it cease growing. Thus original sin remains in us and is active while we live—but one must resist it and cut it off as you cut off the hair." And in how many instances in his writings, does not Luther ennoble the apparently common, and how often does he not render insignificant our treasures. To no one of our poets does this truth better apply. Thus by his commonness, he has dignified our domestic life, house, yard, garden, nursery, kitchen and cellar, yea our language and poetry. But at last, everything that we regard beautiful and desirable on earth seemed to him poor and empty. "The Word alone had an eternal energy." On God's word indeed depended everything. Everywhere we catch the echo of the divine power of the Word, but above all in his hymns.

# ARTICLE IX.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

### ENGLISH.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*God's Revelation of Himself to Men;* as successively made in the Patriarchal, Jewish and Christian dispensations, and in the Messianic Kingdom, by S. J. Andrews. *The Two Books of Nature and Revelation Collated*, by G. D. Armstrong, D. D. *From Accadia to Machpelah*, or the Homes and Journeyings of Abraham, by Rev. Jas. M. Thompson. *In Aid of Faith*, by Dr. Lyman Abbott. *Right Life*, or Candid Talks on Vital Themes, by Dr. Jos. A. Seiss. *Joseph the Prime Minister*, by Dr. Wm. M. Taylor. *Probation and Punishment*, a Rational and Scriptural Exposition of the Doctrine of Future Punishment as held by the great body of Christian believers in all Ages, with special reference to the Unscriptural Doctrine of a Second Probation, by S. M. Vernon, D. D. *The Great Question*, and Other Sermons, by W. Alexander, D. D. *The People's Bible;* discourses upon Holy Scriptures, by Jos. Parker, D. D. *The Six Day's Creation, The Fall, and the Deluge*, by J. B. Riemensnyder, D. D. *The Apostolic and Post Apostolic Times*, Their Diversity and Unity in Life and Doctrine, by Gotthard V. Lechler, D. D., translated by A. J. K. Davidson, vols. I. and II. (T. and T. Clark). *Vital Questions Pertaining to Christian Belief*, by M. Rhodes, D. D. *Modern Unitarianism*, Essays and Sermons by Rev. Jas. Freeman Clarke, D. D., and others. *The Gospel and Philosophy*, Six Lectures preached in Trinity Chapel, N. Y., by Morgan Dix, D. D., D. C. L. *Four Centuries of Silence*, or From Malachi to Christ, by Rev. R. A. Redford, M. A., LL. B. *The Jewish Altar*, an Inquiry into the Spirit and intent of the Expiatory Ritual, by John Leighton, D. D.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*Microcosmos;* an essay concerning man and his relation to the world, by Herman Lotze. *Discussions on Climate and Cosmology*, by Ja. Croll. *The Mammalia in Their Relation to Primeval Times*, by Oscar Schmidt, (International Sc. Series). *Kant's Ethics*, a Critical Exposition, by Noah Porter (Ger. Philosophical Classics). *Theism* and Evolution, an Examination of Modern Speculative Theories as related to the Theistic Conceptions of the Universe, by Jos. S. Van Dyke, D. D. *The Order of Creation*, the Conflict between Genesis and Geology, a Controversy, by W. E. Gladstone and T. H. Huxley. *The World and the Logos*, by Bishop Hugh M. Thompson (Bedell Lectures). *The Logic of Introspection*, or Method in Mental Science, by Rev. J. B. Wentworth, D. D. *Human Psychology*, an In-

troduction to Philosophy, by E. Janes, A. M. *Solar Heat, Gravitation, and Sun-Spots*, by J. H. Kedzie. *Via Moralis Vincendi*, or the Origin, Basis, Psychology, and Elements of Duty, by Wm. W. Green. *The Philosophy of the Supernatural*, by W. H. Platt, D. D., LL. D. *Psychology*, the Cognitive Powers, by Jas. McCosh, D. D., LL. D.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*Prince Bismarck:* An historical biography, by C. Lowe. *Marlborough*, by G. Saintsburg. *John Bunyan*, his life, times, and works, by J. Brown. *Outlines of Universal History*, designed as a text-book and for private readings, by G. Fisher, D. D. *Tiryns*, the prehistoric palace of the kings of Tiryns; the results of the latest excavations, by H. Schliemann. *A short History of Napoleon the First*, by J. Seeley. *History of the Pacfic States*, vol. 16. California, by A. L. Bancroft. *The Greeks of To-day*, by Charles Tuckerman. *The Story of Norway*, by Hjalmar H. Boyeson. *Story of Germany*, by Sabine Baring-Gould, M. A.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Verses:* Translations from the German, and hymns, by W. H. Furness—see notice. *Old Wells Dug Out:* being a third series of sermons, by T. De Witt Talmage. *Three Years of Arctic Service:* an account of the Lady Franklin Bay expedition of 1881–84 and the attainment of the farthest north, by Adolphus W. Greely. *Musical History*, briefly narrated and technically discussed, with a roll of the names of musicians, and the times and places of their births and deaths, by G. A. Macfarren. *The Marriage Ring*, a series of discourses in the Brooklyn Tabernacle, by Dr. De Witt T. Talmage. *New Catechism of the Third Plenary Council* of Baltimore. *Socialism* and Christianity, by A. J. T. Behrends, D. D. *Mechanics and Faith*, a Study of Scriptural Truth in Nature, by Chas. T. Porter.

GERMAN.

THEOLOGICAL.—*Der Gottesbegriff in den heidnischen Religionen d. Alterthums.* A Study in Comparative Religion. Ch. Pesch. pp. 144. Freiburg i. Br. *Die Christliche Wahrheit*, für das Verständniss der Gegenwart dargestellt in Vorträgen. Past. K. Franck. pp. 411, Berlin. *Die Gewissheit unseres Christenglaubens.* Eine Gemeinverständliche Verteidigung des Christenthums. Pfr. Wilh. Baur. pp. 133, Gotha. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte.* A Harnack. I. Bd. Die Entstehung des Kirchl. Dogmas. pp. 696. Freiburg i. Br. *Der Begriff der Christlichen Kirche.* I. Tl.: Studien für Geschichte des Begriffes der Kirche mit besonderer Beziehung auf die Lehre von der sichtbaren und unsichtbaren Kirche. Privatdoc M. R. Seeberg. pp. 236, Erlangen. *Die Theologie des Alten Testaments*, in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung dargestellt. A. Kayser. Published after the Author's death by Dr. Edward Reuss. pp. 264. Strasburg. Van Oostersee's *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, is out in a second edition. pp. 279. Bremen. Luthardt's *Kompendium der Dogmatik* has reached the

7th edition. pp. 394, Leipsic. When shall we have the first edition of a good English translation? *Zwingli's Theologie*, ihr Werden und ihr System. Dr. Aug. Baur. pp. 543. Halle. Dorner's *System der Christlichen Wahrheit* 2. Aufl. I. Bd. Grundlegung oder Apologetik. pp. 749. Berlin. Frank's, F. H. R. *System der Christlichen Wahrheit* 2. Hälfte. 2. Aufl. pp. 517. Erlangen.

BIBLICAL.—*Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Johannes.* Prof. Dr. Paul Shanz. Part I. pp. 297. Tübingen. *Die Gemeinde Ordnung in den Pastoralbriefen.* Insp. Dr. Ernst Kühl. pp. 152. Berlin. In the new revision of H. A. W. Myer's *Kritisch Exegetischer Commentar üb. das Neue Testament*, vols. IV and XI have appeared. The former makes the 7th revision of the Commentary on Romans, the latter the 5th revision of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, both by Dr. B. Weiss. pp. 680, 400. Göttingen. *Das alte Testament bei Johannes.* Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung und Beurtheilung der Johanneischen Schriften. Privatdoc. Lic. A. H. Franke. pp. 316. Göttingen. *Der Zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas.* Eine Geschichtliche Untersuchung. Friedr. Spitta. pp. 544 Halle. The author defends the Canonicity of II. Peter. Zeller's *Biblisches Wörterbuch für das Christliche Volk* has appeared in the 3d, thoroughly revised edition, 2 vols. pp. 724, 668, Karlsruhe. Simultaneously a rival to it under the title: *Calwer Bibellexicon* Biblisches Handwörterbuch, illustriert. Unter Mitwirkung von P. Braun, Friedr. Delitzsch, F. Godet. Th. Oehler. Orelli, &c., redigiert von Diak. Lic. P. Zeller. pp. 1036. Calw. u. Stuttgart. *Das Neue Testament griechisch mit Kurgem Commentar* nach Dr. W. M. L. Dewette. Part II. containing the Epistles and the Apocalypse. pp. 762. Halle. This work contains the full Greek text according to the latest recension of Tischendorf and brief and excellent notes taken from Dewette's *Handbuch.*

HISTORICAL.—*Jesus Nazarenus und die erste christliche Zeit*, mit den beiden ersten Erzählern. Prof. Dr. Gust. Volkmar. pp. 403. Zurich. *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi.* 2. rev. Edition of the Lehrbuch der neutestamentl. Zeitgeschichte. Vol. II. Die inneren Zustände Palästina's und des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter J. C. Prof. D. Emil Schürer. pp. 884. Leipsic. *Dr. Martin Luther's Leben, Thaten und Meinungen*, auf Grund reichlicher Mitteilungen aus seinen Briefen und Schriften dem Volke erzählt. Paul Martin (Lic. Rade), 2. Bd. pp. 746. Neusalza. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte.* Prof. Dr. Adolph Haruack. I. Bd. Die Entstehung des Kirchlichen Dogmas. pp. 696. Freiburg i. Br. *W. Löhes Leben* aus seinem Schriftlichen Nachlass zusammengestellt. III. vol. Part I. pp. 144. Gutersloh. *Der Islam im Morgen-und Abendland.* Mit Abbildungen und Karten. Aug. Müller. I. Bd. 1—3 Lfg. pp. 480. Berlin. *Ausserbiblische Nachrichten*, oder die Apokryphen über die Geburt, Kindheit und das Lebensende Jesu und Maria. Pfr. Ant. Tappehorn.

pp. 88. Paderborn. *Das Apostolische und das nachapostolische Zeitalter* mit Rücksicht auf Unterschied und Einheit in Leben und Lehre. Prof. Dr. G. Vict. Lechler. This able and standard history of the Apostolic age has reached the 3d edition, completely revised. pp. 635. Karlsruhe. *Zinzendorf in Verhältniss Zu Philosophie und Kirchenthum seiner Zeit.* B. Becker. pp. 580. Leipsic.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Glaubenskämpfe und Friedenswerke.* Bilder und Skizzen. Hofkaplan Dr. Friedr. Braun. pp. 310. Stuttgart. A collection of nine papers on various subjects. "St. Elizabeth," "Luther's Theses," "The Anabaptists," "Elizabeth Frey," etc. *Gesammelte Vorträge und Abhandlungen* ans seinen letzen Lebensjahren. Richard Rothe. Eingeleitet von F. Nippold. pp. 208. Elberfeld. *System der christlichen Sittenlehre.* Dr. J. A. Dorner. Edited by his son, Dr. A. Dorner. pp. 560. Berlin. *Die Welt des Glaubens und die Alltagswelt.* Dargelegt nach den Fusstapfen Abrahams. Otto Funcke. pp. 411. Bremen. *Charakterbilder zur Charakterbildung.* Altes und Neues. M. Frommel. 2. enlarged edition. pp. 214. Bremen. *Die Unzulänglichkeit des Theologischen Studiums der Gegenwart.* Ein Wort an Docenten, Pfarrer und Studenten. pp. 109. Leipsic. This anonymous work touches with a strong hand this burning question of German Protestantism. *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher.* Prof. Dr. Fr. H. Reusch. Ein Beitrag Zur Kirchen-und Literaturgeschichte, 2 vols. pp. 624, 1266. Bonn. *Handbuch der geistlichen Beredsamkeit.* Prof. Dr. Heinrich Basserman. pp. 638. Stuttgart. *Die Bedeutung des Alten Testaments für die Christliche Predigt.* E. Bindemann. pp. 346. Gütersloh. *Zur Statistik der evangelischen Mission.* Dr. R. Grundmann. pp. 88. Gütersloh.

---

## ARTICLE X.

### NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

J. C. HINRICH, LEIPZIG.

*Der Offenbahrungsbegriff des Alten Testaments.* Von Dr. Friedrich Edward König, Licentiat und Privatdocent der Theologie an der Universität Leipzig. 2 vols., 212 and 410 pp. 8vo.

In the Old Testament discussions of our day the question concerning the origin, character and mission of prophecy under the old dispensation has been given a peculiar turn and been accorded an importance different from that assigned to it by the theologians of earlier generations. The rationalizing, if not rationalistic, views of the now prevailing school of thought in this department, led by such men as Kuenen, Wellhausen, and others, see in prophecy not the speech and voice of

God finding utterance through the mouth of the chosen instruments, but rather a phenomenon in Israel owing its origin and development to national, local and other peculiarities in the historical unfolding of this people's religion and worship. In other words, it is a natural product of the times and circumstances, and as such does not generally differ from phenomena in the worship of other nations that on the face bear some similarity to Old Testament prophecy. Another new interpretation given to prophecy is that it, and not the law, stands at the head of the religious development of Israel, and that far from working hand in hand with the law for the furtherance of God's objects and aims in his chosen people, it stands antagonistic to the legal features of this religion, and was virtually suppressed and supplanted by them. The new school of Old Testament critics thus revolutionized the traditional views of prophecy as they do those of the law,

It is with this important problem in its aspect as modified by later criticism that König's book deals. He treats chiefly of the character of prophecy and only secondarily of its relation to the other factors of the religious life in Israel. His work is a specimen of Biblical theology in the best sense of the word. He examines, without proceeding from a preconceived theory or hypothesis as to what prophecy ought to have been, into the statements of the prophets themselves concerning their work, their character, the origin and source of information, their authority and other problems connecting with the central question of prophecy. The book is rich in discussions and detailed exegesis of passages bearing on this problem. The outcome of the examiner is a defense and vindication of what Christ and the apostles and with them the Christian church of all ages have taught concerning prophets and prophecy. Not that every word could find sanction, but the trend and char acter of the discussion is certainly most commendable, and the whole a rich store-house for the student of Old Testament prophecy.

While thus approving of the matter, we cannot be so well pleased with the manner of the work. The book has the same fault in this regard that other works of the author have, *e. g.* his discussion of the pentateuchal problem. The material is not as systematically arranged as it ought to be; the whole appearing too much like the copy of notes taken by the author when reading or studying his sources of information and the authors he consulted. Important and unimportant, leading and subordinate matter is mixed promiscuously, both in the text and in the notes. This makes the use of the work more difficult than it would otherwise have been, especially as the indexes also are quite meagre.

HARPER AND BROTHERS, FRANKLIN SQUARE, NEW YORK.

*History of Christian Doctrine.* By Henry C. Sheldon, Professor of Historical Theology in Boston University. In two volumes. pp. 411, 444. 1886.

A work of this kind has long been a *desideratum* especially in Theo-

logical Seminaries. As teachers are to depend mainly on text-books, it is of great importance to have such manuals as measure up to the subject and at the same time are adapted to classes in course of instruction. The two volumes before us meet this want to some extent and they are to be welcomed as a creditable and substantial contribution to our theological literature. As a text-book this is certainly a great improvement on Hagenbach and Shedd and it will doubtless replace them in many institutions. The long and numerous citations of the former from Greek and Latin authors, which are so formidable to the average American graduate, are here either omitted or rendered into plain English. The author is perspicuous and fresh in style, discriminating, scholarly and impartial in the treatment of diverse views and has evidently formed a large acquaintance with this important branch of historic study. We miss indeed the masterly thoroughness of Münscher, Gieseler, Baur and Thomasius, but the work is probably on that very account better adapted to our present standard of divinity.

A more serious defect is the mechanical representation which is here made of the history of doctrine. Christian truth is a living organism. Not only do all its parts form an essential unity, but the universal law of growth has nowhere a better illustration than in the progress of the doctrines of the Church. The successive ages with their diversities of apprehension and modifications of definition are but the natural unfoldings of the same vital and unchangeable verities, and the student can be made to recognize not only these formal changes in the unchangeable substance, but also the inherent life-principle by which these changes were developed and guided. Mosaics may answer for representations of art, but in the domain of a vital force like the truth, the changes are those of a natural, organic and evolutionary process. The author's usual conciseness forsakes him when he attempts to force Zwinglian sacramental views into the statements of Justin and Irenaeus. Instead of leaving to their simple language its manifest meaning and classifying them with the realists as all great historians have done, he would have us believe "that they taught that the bread and wine in the Eucharist are conjoined with the heavenly Word, exhibit in virtue of this union an image of the primal assumption by the Word of flesh or earthly material, so that they may be styled his body and blood, and in virtue of the same union possess a peculiar virtue which makes them food of immortality." We prefer the declarations of these fathers to that of their interpreter, thankful that blemishes of this character are not so numerous as to neutralize the excellencies of the book. The best of authors will nod, hence we are not overwhelmed with the surprising classification which includes "in the list of Lutheran theologians reputed orthodox, or relatively so," Neander, Rothe, Tholuck, Dorner and Bernhard Weiss. Even Lutherans when they want to swell the figures of the denomination are foolish enough to count all Germans

as belonging to their church; but surely a theological writer ought to be sufficiently informed to know that the lines are somewhat more strictly drawn in Germany between Lutheran and anti-Lutheran theologians.

*A History of Modern Europe.* From the capture of Constantinople by the Turks to the Treaty of Berlin, 1878. By Richard Lodge, M. A., Fellow and Tutor of Brazenose College, Oxford. pp. 772. 1886.

One of the most successful efforts of succinct, comprehensive, impartial and absorbing history that we have met. No other period is indeed so rich in historic material as the last four hundred years, covering as they do the conflict of Europe with the Turks, the Reformation, the Thirty Years' War, the Dutch Republic, Louis XIV., Frederick the Great and Napoleon. But the author is able to give his readers a vivid portrayal of the successive great movements, and graphic sketches of the chief actors in these historic scenes. Since the great body of educated people cannot find time for the study of the voluminous works which have been written on the principal events of modern times, we count it a great boon to them to have at hand this rapid survey which will serve them both as a work of reference and as a volume for close reading. It belongs to the "Students' Series." Some may feel a sense of disappointment that the History of England has been omitted except so far as it is directly connected with the history of the continental states, but the work must otherwise inevitably have expanded into two volumes, and Prof. Brewers' recent edition of "the Students' Hume" in this series will answer every purpose as a companion to the present work. There is a very complete Chronological Table and a most valuable alphabetical Index.

*What does History Teach?* Two Edinburgh Lectures, by John Stuart Blackie. pp. 119. The first of these historic surveys discusses the State, the second is a review of the Church.

The mind of a thinker, the hand of a master, and the breadth of a liberal scholor are impressed upon every page. The historical student who is capable of intellectual self-control will find here a savory feast of strong and stimulating food.

*Joseph the Prime-Minister.* By Rev. William M. Taylor, D. D., LL. D., Minister of the Broadway Tabernacle, N. Y. City. pp. 241. 1866.

Of this kind of literature we cannot have too much in our families and Sunday Schools. Dr. Taylor is putting the Christian public under great obligations for his successive volumes on Bible characters. He has the happy power of using them as striking illustrations for modern life and he gathers from their vicissitudes, their virtues and their infirmities very forceful lessons for the young and old of to-day. Such

simplicity of style is rarely combined with such energy of thought. Joseph, even for a sacred personage, furnishes uncommon richness and variety of material to a clever author, and never to our knowledge has this material been more happily employed than in these bright and racy pages.

*George Eliot and Her Heroines.* Abba Goold Woolson.

George Eliot, one of the most conspicuous figures of modern literature, affords a fascinating study to the critic. We gather much knowledge of her from her books, but, since the publication of her life, we see more clearly her purpose and motives. Whilst her power as a literary artist, her wonderful intellectual vigor, her great learning are preëminent, she is also a representation of revolt from Christianity and an apostle of the scientific ethics of the day. It adds however to the fascination of the study of her works and life. We find in Miss Woolson a strong, discriminating estimate of George Eliot. She always compels our respectful attention, though we may differ from her conclusions. The analysis of contents in the beginning of the volume indicates the clear and vivid criticisms made. There is sustained strength throughout with the exception of the Fifth Chapter, "Is real life responsible for the failures she portrays?"

The greatest quality of George Eliot is found in the portrayal of character specially in her heroines. Her richness and profundity of speculative thought are justly ranked next. These however are obvious to all, and we therefore find, in the searching analysis of other qualities, the keen observations of a strong critic. An enthusiastic admirer, she does not hesitate to indicate the faults of the great novelist. Her want of bold and aggressive force, her looseness of structure, the lack of virile strength in the male characters and the like are clearly set forth.

There is special interest in the presentation of George Eliot as we might expect from the title, in relation to women and the emancipation of women. There is a fine study of the peculiar infelicity of the marriages of the heroines and of their connection in the mind of George Eliot as a defence of her own unhappy rejection of the bonds of marriage, which well repays perusal.

The judgment of the ethical system of George Eliot is also well worth consideration, though it lacks distinctive reference to Christ, whether intentional or not, and is thereby weakened. It is Deistic rather than Christian. Even the altruism of this great woman is manifestly Christian as a recent writer has pointed out. Her theory of life is self-sacrifice, which brings failure in real life in outward relations, but greatness in inward development of character. Romola is a type of self-sacrifice ending in greatness of soul, matured through pain and disappointment, whilst Tito, incarnation of selfishness, deteriorates into worthlessness.

The book will be welcomed by all lovers of George Eliot and by all who would seek a truer knowledge of this remarkable woman.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON, NEW YORK.

For Sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co. Phila.

*Platform and Pulpit Aids.* pp. 286. 1886.

This volume contains a collection of specimen sermons and addresses from some of the most popular and distinguished public orators of Great Britain. Among the contributors are the names of Newman Hall, Dr. Parker, Dr. Dale and the late Archbishop Tait. There are five divisions: Home Work, Foreign Missions, Bible Distribution, Temperance and a Miscellaneous section comprising a selection of fresh, pithy and humorous illustrations. Much benefit may be derived from the proper use of such aids. If only the aids do not become a substitute for personal activity. We are all of us and all the time learning from others and we are thankful that this work offers for our study some of the best models of English oratory on the platform and the pulpit. The different methods of handling living themes, employed by these divines, are worthy of very careful consideration. To imitate them slavishly or even to appropriate them is quite another thing. This volume constitutes the seventh of the *Clerical Library* series.

*Moments on the Mount:* A series of devotional meditations. By George Matheson, M. A., D. D., Minister of the Parish of Innelan. Second edition. pp. 280. 1886.

Those are blessed moments which are spent on the mount with this book in hand. These meditations are uncommonly well adapted to their purpose. They are more than common-places or religious sentimentalism. Though very brief, they are sermons of an excellent quality. Elevating, fervent, deeply spiritual, and will not only prove helpful in the closet but very suggestive also to those who are called to give counsel to others about the privileges and the mysteries of the hidden life. The work is divided into one hundred and eight meditations and is in every way worthy of high commendation.

E. P. DUTTON & CO., NEW YORK.

*History of Interpretation.* Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year MDCCCLXXXV. on the Foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton. By Frederick W. Farrar, D. D., F. R. S., Archdeacon and Canon of Westminster; Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. pp. 553. 1886.

Whatever Archdeacon Farrar undertakes with his pen is sure to be executed with freshness, ability and force; with scholarship, good sense and independence. He is never dull and never obscure, while his choice of subjects is as a rule very timely and happy. He seems to recognize the gaps in our theological literature and as if desirous of serving the

truth he proceeds to fill up these openings with very substantial material. He is not always orthodox, but he is candid enough not to make special claims of soundness according to received standards, and his trend is so well known that students are likely to read him with a measure of caution. The present work on the History of Interpretation affords him favorable opportunities for condemning the dogmatism of past ages, but the style in which he does this, reveals quite as much of the dogmatic spirit within his own mind and goes accordingly to modify his caustic polemics against his predecessors in dogmatism. The history of Interpretation is divided into Rabbinic Exegesis, Alexandrian, Patristic, Scholastic, The Reformers, Post-Reformation Epoch, and Modern Exegesis, and the eight lectures constitute a monument of learning on this great theme. We have never met with a non-Lutheran author, excepting perhaps the elder Hodge, who showed such familiarity with Lutheran theologians. Whether he always deals justly with them depends somewhat on the judgment one may pass on his own position. Only ignorant audacity can attempt to deny that the representatives of rigid orthodoxy neglected and fettered the scientific interpretation of the Scriptures and that Confessionalism for a long period superseded true Exegesis. The origin of Pietism is sufficient proof of this, were other proofs less numerous than they are.

Bengel receives the warmest appreciation: "A friend to science; a friend to freedom; the first great German critic of the text of the New Testament; profoundly humble yet thoroughly original, he towers above all the scholars and theologians of the Lutheran Church."

The work teems with the author's earnestness and is written in a style that makes fascinating reading. As a series of the Bampton Lectures its professed aim is of course apologetic. The author claims that it has been his sole desire "to defend the cause of Christianity by farthering the interests of truth." With a hearty appreciation of the merits of these lectures, we yet doubt whether this desire will be realized. They are marked by such persistent polemics, such wholesale denunciation of the methods of exegesis which have been in vogue, such a traducement of the entire past that the practical outcome of the work will be likely to shake the faith of the unwary not only in all past interpretations, but in the Church itself which produced these interpreters and in the very Scriptures which they claimed to interpret. It is well enough to point out the erroneous procedure of past epochs and to expose the weak and festering spots of many who affected to expound God's word, but a brighter page might sometimes have been thrown in, with the acknowledgment that the precious truths of the Scriptures have been brought out and preserved despite the infirmities and errors of the divergent schools of exegesis. The past was *not* "all confusion and darkness." Such a statement reminds us of a quotation which the author makes in another connection from Richard Baxter:

"It is the Devil's last method to undo by over-doing." The volume is beautifully gotten up and besides the body of the work has extensive notes for the learned and a copious index. It is destined to have a wide circulation.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

*Kant's Ethics.* A Critical Exposition. By Noah Porter, President of Yale College. pp. 249. 1886.

This is another volume of "Griggs' Philosophical Classics," and one of the most interesting and valuable in the series thus far issued. No man in our country is better qualified than President Porter to analyze and explain the ethical system of the great Königsberg philosopher. The acuteness of his analysis and the vigor of his exposition has made this small volume the best succinct view we know of Kant's ethical teaching. He has penetrated to its very essence, opened its subtle meaning and implications, and drawn it all out so clearly that its merits and defects and errors are easily understood. The unquestionable and strong influence of Kant's theory in all ethical discussions since his day, make it important that his failure as well as his success should be distinctly understood. The intelligent and careful reader of this book will need nothing more for a fair understanding of his system. The fourth chapter which gives a "critical summary of his ethical theory" is an illustration of the very best type of critical analysis and statement. It gives us pleasure to renew our recommendation of all the volumes of this well-prepared philosophical series. M. V.

*Speculations. Solar Heat, Gravitation, and Sun-Spots.* By J. H. Kedzie. pp. 304. 1886.

This book reaches us at too late a date to give it either the thorough examination or notice that its merits seem to deserve. Whatever may be the fate of this new hypothesis as to the source and supply of solar heat, and as to gravitation, etc., Prof. Kedzie has undoubtedly given us a well-written and interesting work. The reader is delighted, from the very start, with the clear, direct, sharp-cut sentences and the evidence that the writer knows precisely what he wishes to state and why. There is neither indecision, ambiguity nor dullness about the progress of statement and discussion.

It may seem an act of temerity for any one now, considering the many renowned scientists that have labored at the problem, to venture a new explanation of the nature and continued supply of the solar heat. But the utterly unsatisfactory character of all the theories heretofore advanced, not only allows but calls for further hypotheses, and Mr. Kedzie's attempted explanation, whether under the ordeal through which it must pass, it shall find acceptance or not, has elements of reasonable ness and probability unquestionably superior to the old ones in lieu of which it is offered.

The theory here suggested is based on three postulates—the virtually infinite duration of the universe, its virtually infinite extension, and the conservation of energy, and the transfer under all the various forms of heat, motion, electricity, magnetism, chemical action, etc. The universe is considered as a plenum of ether, in the infinite ocean of which all bodies are moving. *Heat* is viewed as "the primal and unspecialized form of energy, including in itself all other forms, embracing in itself the promise and potency of all the forms of energy that figure in heaven and earth." As the heat, therefore, flows out from the sun, it must at certain stages of progress become specialized or separated into electricity, magnetism, gravitation or chemical action, etc., without losing an iota of quantity or efficiency. In the never-ending progress of these forms of energy they are conveyed back through ether-vibrations to the sun and are despecialized again in the special form of heat. Thus the sun is ever gaining back from the universe as much as it sends forth. "In short," says Prof. Kedzie, "the theory of solar heat here adduced is substantially this: All the suns of space, blazing with inconceivable intensity of heat, have been pouring forth that heat by radiation into the ethereal ocean for infinite ages. Not an iota of all this heat has been lost or destroyed. But it has assumed and is assuming other forms, else the ether would be surcharged with ever increasing heat. Not only does this heat assume other forms, but the ethereal ocean must have exactly as many and as large outlets of this energy as it has inlets or fountains pouring into it. Every sun is a hole in the sky, which drinks up or absorbs just as much energy from the ether as it pours into it by radiation. Every sun is a consumer as well as a producer, ä receiver as well as a sender. He receives vibrations of mechanical force, electricity, magnetism, etc. He issues them in the general unsifted form of radiant light and heat."

"Gravitation, according to the theory, is simply a mechanical force coming from every point in the celestial concave and centering in the sun."

The whole theory is well worked out, illustrated and defended. The volume abounds in evidences of the author's familiarity with the scientific knowledge connected with the problem on hand, and altogether forms a deeply interesting "speculation." M. V.

R. J. OLIPHANT, OSWEGO, N. Y.

*Via Moralis Vincendi*, or the Origin, Basis, Psychology and Elements of Duty. By William W. Green. pp. 388. 1885.

The aim of this work is practical rather than speculative. There is no effort to sound the troubled depths of the metaphysics of duty. The ultimate ground of right and wrong, or of the ethical distinction, is not discussed. A few sentences, however, place the basis of morals in conformity to the will of God as indicated in the nature and relations given

us and made known in his word. "The fundamental theory of this book," says the preface, "is that all the obligations of duty, like all the laws of physics, are ordained of God, and that each law of duty has its genesis in the God-ordained constitution of man and his relations to other things and beings." No theory of conscience or the moral faculty is put forth, but it is evidently held as a power of the reason judging of duty in all the various relations of life in the light of a knowledge of the relations concerned. It is treated as universal, and needing, for correct discriminations and decisions, the largest knowledge and best training it can have.

On this safe and practical basis Mr. Green treats first of *General Duties*, and then of *Specific Virtues or Vices*. The various chapters of both divisions of the book are of the nature of applied ethics, and set forth some important principles and a wise and judicious application of them. Strong and eloquent presentations of duty abound throughout the volume. Its non-speculative method makes it eminently adapted for the use and help of the masses of our intelligent people, and its wide circulation will do great good. It will help right Christian living in the family, society, and business.

The style of the author is, here and there, open to criticism. It is not equal to the excellent matter of the volume. Sentences are occasionly wanting in directness, clearness or consistency. For example, that on p. 36, beginning at line 18; on p. 36, beginning in line 2, and p. 38, line 11. We object too, to classing "the Church" as simply a natural institution among others which are "an outgrowth of the spirit of the age in which they exist." From the whole teaching of the book, it is clear Mr. Green does not intend this, but this putting of it has resulted from a loose use of the term "church." But the few faults of this kind are not to weigh against the genuine merits of the work, so Christian in its teaching and so sound in its application of ethical principles to practical life. M. V.

JANSEN, M'CLURG & CO., CHICAGO.

*Four Centuries of Silence;* or From Malachi to Christ. By the Rev. R. A. Redford, M. A., LL. B., Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics, New College, London; Author of "The Christian's Plea against Modern Unbelief," "Studies in the Book of Jonah," etc., etc. 1885. pp. 258.

Mr. Redford has done an excellent service in giving, from the accumulated results of modern research, a clear, condensed view of the interesting and important period treated of in this book. Though he does not present himself as an original investigator among the sources of information, he has accomplished what is often a more difficult and not less useful achievement, the construction out of the mass of varied material, of a consistent and reliable conception and account of the period as a whole.

The author introduces his view of these four centuries of silence, when there was "no open vision," by an examination of the peculiar characteristics of the prophecy of Malachi, whose message remained, "like the glow of an evening sky," to keep alive among the people the expectation of the coming day of Christ. He traces the changes in the High-priesthood, with its seizure and use of political power, and its relation to the character and fortunes of the Jewish people. The connection of the Jews with other nations through the conquests of Alexander, the subjugation of Palestine by Ptolomy Lagus, the settlement of many Jews in Egypt and elsewhere, and the influence of these events, are graphically brought to view. He sketches the origin of the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, of the Apocrypha, and the rise of the Alexandrian school of Jewish thought. The account moves on through the rise of the Jewish sects, the growth of the Messianic expectation, the Sanhedrim, till the Light dawned and the Voice in the Wilderness heralded the day of Christ. The whole story is replete with interest to every thoughtful student of Christianity. Whatever other extended and elaborate works he may have read on the subject, he will have his view of the period cleared and unified by the setting here given to its history. At the same time, its popular form and brevity adapt it to the needs of the people in general.

The work is marked throughout by the evidences of wide and careful reading, discriminating mastery of the materials, and cautious and trustworthy judgment. M. V.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON.

For Sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

*A Harmony of the Four Gospels in English.* According to the Common Version. Newly arranged, with explanatory Notes. By Edward Robinson, D. D., LL, D., lately Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York; author of Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, Biblical Researches in Palestine, etc., etc. Revised Edition, with Foot Notes from the Revised Version of 1881, and Additional Notes, by M. B. Riddle, D. D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Hartford Theological Seminary. pp. 205. 1886.

Dr. Robinson's work has long been conceded to be one of the most successful attempts to present a correct harmony of the Gospels, and has ranked as a standard authority. Both its excellences and defects however have called for a revised edition, with such slight modifications and explanations as should bring the whole work into accord with the best accrued results of recent Biblical research. But few changes have been made in the general arrangement. Some of these represent Dr. Robinson's own later judgments, as indicated in the more recent editions of the Greek Harmony. Others are the result of an effort to

present the parallel clauses in parallel lines. A number of passages are transferred to other sections, in the interest of what is now judged to be the more correct harmony. The *text* of the Authorized Version is retained, but carefully corrected to conform to the standard English editions. Foot-notes, however, have been added, presenting the more important emendations of the text from the Revised Version of 1881. This is a new feature of value. The Appendix corresponds with that in the revised edition of the Greek Harmony, with a few changes required by the latest knowledge and with some additions by the editor, in brackets, bringing Dr. Robinson's arguments down to the present conditions of the controversy concerning the Gospels.

With these improvements, made by the careful and scholarly hand of Dr. Riddle, "Robinson's English Harmony of the Gospels" is certain to retain its high place of favor among Bible students. The excellent work of the "Riverside Press" has added to the comfort and convenience of its use. M. V.

*The Transfiguration of Christ.* By Frank Wakeley Gunsaulus. 1886. pp. 267.

Mr. Gunsaulus is well imbued with the spirit of Christian mysticism. It seems to be of a good sort, without the doctrinal aberrations often exhibited under its influence. He, however, presses to extreme the method: *Credo ut intelligam.* "Jesus Christ," he says, "does not manifest His essential God-head more plainly than in the spiritual faith He demands as fundamental to any intellectual apprehension of Him." While this spirit has not been permitted to check the action of the speculative inclination, it has given that action both the daring and the mistiness that usually connect themselves with religious thought when guided rather by the spiritual consciousness than the deductions of cold logic. This has both its good and bad results. It becomes at once the source of a rich suggestiveness and of much indefiniteness and haze. There are in this small volume many outlooks into grand and far-reaching truths, truths remote from the common vision of men and beyond the common-places of Christian meditation, but in many cases they are simply made to glimmer obscurely on the horizon of view without being lifted above it. The author has 'seen them afar off and embraced them.' Frequently the statements are but sheet-lightning, with no definite outline or determinable shape. While there are passages of translucent, sharp-cut thought and glowing eloquence, there are others that exhibit only semi-illuminated fog.

The Transfiguration furnishes an open field for the imagination and exegetical ingenuity. The discussion consists of eight lectures. The first is preliminary, and sets forth the Nature and Method of Christian thinking, in the law that Faith must precede and condition it. The

second discusses the Time of the event and finds it meant to open the view of the disciples into the invisibility and spirituality of the New Kingdom. The third, on the Place, traces Christ's relation to nature, the laws of prayer, and divine companionship. The succeeding lectures treat of The Transfigured Christ, The Appearance of Moses, The Appearance of Elias, Jesus Only, and the pointing of the Transfiguration to the resurrection. Despite the faults of the book, the student of the Transfiguration will find it not only worthy of study, but interesting and quickening, and, by its suggestive power enriching his conception of the wealth of truth centred in and reflected from that wonderful event of the "holy mount." M. V.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON, NEW YORK.
For Sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co. Phila.

*Theism and Evolution.* An Examination of Modern Speculative Theories as related to Theistic Conceptions of the Universe. By Joseph S. Van Dyke, D. D., Author of "Through the Prison to the Throne," "From Gloom to Gladness," etc. With an Introduction by Archibald A. Hodge, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. 1886. pp. 483.

We have here another valuable discussion of the hypothesis of Evolution in its relation to Christian Theism. The position of the author is not that of total rejection of evolution, but of discriminating repudiation of all forms of the hypothesis which start from atheistic assumptions or are shaped into conflict with the truths of Christianity. His concessions to it as a *mode* of creation in connection with the lower orders of animals and even the human body, are probably in excess of what the facts in the case require, but he seeks to show how utterly insufficient and unsatisfactory it is when offered as a theory of the origin of things apart from the presence and absolute creatorship of a Supreme and Almighty Intelligence. "While there is difficulty," he says in his preface, "in believing it possible that man's physical nature is an evolution from the lower animals, and still greater difficulty in imagining that his intellectual faculties may be, it is apparently impossible to conceive that his moral and religious nature could have been evolved from animals destitute of even their germs."

Dr. Van Dyke's discussion, however, begins far back of the origin of man, and covers the entire field of the origin of matter, of force, of law, of life, of mind, of freedom, of conscience and man's religious nature. He is evidently thoroughly familiar with the hypothesis in its various phases and claims, is abreast of the latest thought of its friends, and master of the materials of the subject. His discussion is marked by acute analysis and vigorous statement, and forms an impressive exhibition of the difficulties in the way of establishing any theory of evolution based on materialistic or atheistic principles, or in any form which

refuses to harmonize and coalesce with spiritual views of man or the Scripture doctrines as to man's nature and destiny.

The critical reader will probably take just exception to a few things in the book. The author is occasionally careless in the choice of his terms. For instance: he speaks of "mentality as an entity distinct from matter," when he means not the abstract quality, "mentality," but the concrete substance, *mind.* Preface, p. xii. Similarly on p. 36, he hardly means to concede evolution to be a real "cause." Dr. Van Dyke, however much he is willing to concede to evolutionist theology, could scarcely have thought of the full force of his statement, p. 47, "Design under existing theories leaves more unexplained than it explains"—when even the long and overdrawn list of inexplicable items which he adds will not sum up even a hundredth part of the aggregate ends of nature for which the common theology furnishes ample explanation. We are surprised, too, at the credit for soundness given to Henry Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," when a little close scrutiny of it reveals the fact that Drummond's explanations on the asserted basis of *identity* of law is, after all, really only on the basis of *analogy* of law.

But these slight slips and others ought not to weigh against the ability and merit of this excellent work. The volume deserves wide circulation among intelligent men. It must be counted among those valuable works which have been completing the proof, for some time already assured, of the utter failure of the theorizers who have attempted to establish non-theistic evolutionism or hypotheses which leave no room for the moral and spiritual nature of man or the verities of religion.

M. V.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA.

*Right Life;* or Candid Talks on Vital Themes. By Joseph a Seiss, D. D., LL. D., Pastor of the Church of the Holy Communion, Philadelphia. pp. 382. 1886.

Dr. Seiss's recognized success in making good and acceptable books is well sustained in this new volume. It belongs to the department of "Apologetics," as a popular indication of the great fundamental truths of Theism and Christianity. Books of this kind, and written with the vigor here shown, are called for by the times. One of the most striking features of our day is the aggressiveness of skepticism and infidelity. Every channel is used to send forth criticism of the great Christian truths and circulate agnostic and atheistic literature. The bad influence needs counteraction. The more books prepared and issued in this service the better.

The volume is made up of twelve lectures, the first presenting introductory considerations, the rest on the Existence of God, Belief in God, Religion, Reason and Revelation, Revelation Demonstrated, the Revelation by Christ, Implied Results, the Supreme Demand, Christ

the Only Hope, and Faith and Unbelief. Twenty-two pages of Addenda are given. This list of contents shows that they are truly "vital themes." They are discussed with Dr. Seiss's well-known force, clearness and impressiveness. M. V.

FUNK & WAGNALLS, NEW YORK.

*Commentary on the Gospel of John* with an historical and critical introduction by F. Godet, Doctor in Theology and Professor in the Faculty of Neuchátel. Vol. I. Translated from the third French Edition, with a Preface, introductory Suggestions, and Additional Notes by Timothy Dwight, Professor of Sacred Literature in Yale College. pp. 559. 1886.

Godet has long held his place in the first rank of Commentators. His work on the Gospel of John was first published twenty years ago and such has been its appreciation by the theological world that translations of it have appeared in German, English, Dutch, Danish and Swedish, and a third edition of the original has just been brought out. The author has made each successive edition a thorough revision of its predecessor, and although by the same hand, this third revision like the latest revision of Meyer by other hands, bears largely the impress of a new work. It combines the excellencies of the original edition with the merits of a fresh volume that is marked not only by much additional matter but by the ripest learning and maturest judgment of the author.

The present volume in English contains one-half of the book, including the General Introduction (vol. I.) of the original and the Commentary as far as the end of the fifth chapter of the Gospel, or about four-fifths of Vol. II. The remainder of the translation, it is expected, will be published about the first of July, 1886.

We regard this Commentary as an able and valuable contribution to the study of the Fourth Gospel. It is evangelical in tone, clear in style, forcible in statement, and very learned. In fact the average mind that expects to be benefited by Commentaries, will find this one like many others overdone with learning. As a history and criticism of the interpretation of individual passages it is unsurpassed, but only a small class has either disposition or capacity to traverse a bewildering succession of opinions and counter-opinions, expositions and refutations, author contradicting author, until the reader who started in search of light is confounded with darkness. Page after page bristles with the names and differing views of Beza, Schleiermacher, Tholuck, Baumlein, Hoffman, Lücke, Weiss, Lange, Strauss, Baur, Calvin, Knapp, Luthardt, etc., etc. Not what say these expositors, but what says the Lord is the question which a Commentator is expected to answer.

The introduction, extending over more than two hundred pages is exhaustive and most satisfactory, leading the unbiased student to the author's "firm *Scientific* Conviction of the Authenticity of this Gospel."

In its English dress the present work is not a reprint of a British translation. It is the work of Dr. (now Pres.) Dwight. The apology in the preface for his literalism at the expense of elegance is simply an expression of refined modesty. Remove the title-page and we doubt whether any scholar would discover that he is reading a translation. Dr. Dwight's addenda inserted at the end of the volume makes one wish that the whole had come from his rich mind and strong pen.

*The Treasury of David:* Containing an original Exposition of the Book of Psalms; a Collection of illustrative Extracts from the whole Range of Literature; a series of homiletical Hints upon almost every Verse; and Lists of Writings upon each Psalm. By C. H. Spurgeon. Vol. VII. Psalm CXXV to CL. pp. 475. 1886.

This is the last volume of Mr. Spurgeon's great work on the Psalms. Like the other volumes, it is a commentary but cannot be called critical or exegetical, but is, in the fullest sense, practical and homiletical. The selection of illustrative extracts is made with careful discrimination, Mr. Spurgeon evidently having a keen appreciation of what is best for his purpose; but it is only when we come to his own comments that we find the richest and especially the most suggestive thoughts. The whole work has been appropriately named. It is a genuine treasure-house. The truth is, if we were to take any exception to the work, it is that it is too full, leaving very little for any one else to add. For quickening devotion these comments are admirable. Mr. Spurgeon has a right to look upon the whole work with a pardonable pride. The manner in which it has been issued is a credit to the publishers.

THE TRUTH SEEKER COMPANY, 33 CLINTON PLACE, NEW YORK.

*The Order of Creation.* The Conflict between Genesis and Geology. A Controversy between Hon. W. E. Gladstone, Prof. T. H. Huxley, Prof. Max Müller, M. Réville, E. Lynn Linton. pp. 178.

The contents are "Dawn of Creation and of Worship" by Gladstone; "The Interpreters of Genesis and the Interpreters of Nature," by Huxley; "Postscript to Solar Myths," by Max Müller; "Proem to Genesis: A Plea for a Fair Trial," by Gladstone; "Dawn of Creation: An Answer to Mr. Gladstone," by Albert Réville, D. D.; "Mr. Gladstone and Genesis," by Huxley; and "A Protest and a Plea," by Mrs. E. Lynn Linton.

The title page and the contents, as just given, show clearly enough the scope of the controversy in this little volume. Mr. Gladstone, "the grand old man," has not only met with bitter opposition from the enemies of "Home Rule," but, outside of the realm of statecraft, has been attacked for attempting to reconcile the biblical order of creation with geology. Five names appear in the contents, but it is a case of four against one. In the answers to Mr. Gladstone's first article,

which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century Magazine* of last November, Professor Huxley pays special attention to its science and Professor Max Müller to its mythology and etymology. The other two are lesser lights who have entered the controversy because of some allusion to them in Mr. Gladstone's article.

As in almost all such controversies, there is some misapprehension of each other's positions, and hence the real merits of the two sides are not clearly brought out. One cannot fail however, to be struck with Mr. Gladstone's wonderful versatility of genius. He writes on this subject in a way that would do credit to him if it were his specialty, and yet it is scarcely more than a by-play with him. He maintains his side of the question with that clearness and vigor for which he is so well known, and wrestles with his strong antagonists, on their own ground, with a skill that is surprising. As specimens of fine controversial writing, save a few uncalled-for sneers, all the papers deserve mention.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

*The Story of Rome*, from the earliest Times to the End of the Republic. By Arthur Gilman. M. A., author of "A History of the American People," editor of "The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer." etc. pp. 355. 1886.

Covering a period of more than 700 years, and relating to one of the most remarkable nations that ever existed, this history has the merit of presenting vividly a vast amount of material in a very small compass. It belongs to the "Story of the Nations" series, published by the enterprising Putnams, and is one of the best yet issued. Notwithstanding the rhetorical flourish in the preface, the body of the work is characterized by the plain style of history; and, in chapter after chapter, the actors come and go as living beings whom we seem to see. The characterization of Cataline (p. 221), the chapter on "Manners and Customs" and the one on "Roman Reading and Writing" are specially good. In the last-named we find an excellent summary of Roman literature, with brief but pregnant estimates of the different writers, which reminds us of a portion of Quintilian's tenth book of his "Institutes of the Orator." The letter-press of the printer and the tasteful work of the binder give additional attractiveness to the book. It is intended for youths, and will prove delightful to all of this class who find pleasure in reading history.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

*A New Path across an Old Field.* By Rev. M. C. Holloway, A. M. Published for the Author. pp. 303.

Under this title we have here an account of the author's travels in Europe several years ago. Though appearing after some lapse of time, when the author's own interest may have had its edge somewhat worn, the contents were really written when the scenes had scarcely passed

from view and the impressions were still fresh. They appeared first in the *Lutheran Observer*, sent by the author while still on his travels, and hence have, for the most part, the vividness of a present-tense description.

The writer is a Lutheran clergyman and evidently had his eyes and ears open for whatever had any connection with Lutheran history. This is especially apparent while traveling in Germany where the Lutheran places fairly make him glow with enthusiasm. Hence his book will be of special interest to Lutheran readers. Even in Rome he is Lutheran all through, and lets no conspicuous incident in Luther's visit to the "Eternal City" pass unnoticed. The book reminds us, in some respects, of Prime's "Travels in Europe," which appeared quite a number of years ago, but has, above any other, the impress of which we have just spoken. It can be purchased from the author at Middletown, Pa., as well as from the Lutheran Publication House, 42 North Ninth street, Philadelphia.

*Vital Questions Pertaining to Christian Belief.* M. Rhodes, D. D.

This book is the work of an active pastor and is largely based upon lectures delivered to his own congregation. It therefore carries with it much of the rhetoric, fervor and direct appeal of the pulpit, which weakens somewhat its power as a written volume. The glowing sentences, from the lips of an eloquent preacher, suffer when examined in the dry light of quiet thought and interfere with the sharp, condensed and virile statement of truth which makes the printed page strong. It is confirmatory of this that the critic marked the chapter on the "Inspiration of the Bible" very excellent and the one on "Probation After Death" strong. Afterward, on exemination of the preface, he found both of these chapters "were not pronounced in public." We disagree with the author concerning the omission of the "unsightly foot-notes." It is a gain when we can pursuade men to continue a subject to which we have introduced them, and it is a help to them to know the books that have aided us. It is also just to allow them the privilege of verifying our quotations.

The book is an excellent one. It would seem as though another volume on the evidences of Christianity was not required. There have been so many excellent ones ere this. Yet as the attack by skeptics on the Christian faith is directed to different points from time to time and with arguments, which if not always new, presented in fresh garb, the defence must adjust itself to the attack. The author, whilst he repeats many of the old, strong and substantial arguments, uses these freshly and brings forward others successfully against the prevailing infidelity of the day. Evidently he knows it by actual contact of opposition. His own convictions, it is refreshing to observe in these days of haziness of creed, are clear and decided. He is fearless in the expression of them.

He is thoroughly orthodox and holds fast to the teachings of the Church. He does not sympathize with the "New Theology," the strongest chapter probably of the book being directed against their doctrine of probation after death. There is great firmness in his presentation of the weaknesses of infidelity. He justly arraigns it for its unfairness, its superficial knowledge of the Scriptures, its destructive moral tendency and its lack of positive truth. It can destroy, but it cannot give life. Herbert Spencer can write a book on ethics which might direct the pure and strong but has no regeneration for the weak and vicious. The whole book is characterized by a deep religious fervor which is so honest and sincere that it wins upon the reader continually.

We can cordially commend these pages to all who may be disturbed by the attacks of skepticism. It will assist them in obtaining a clear understanding of the fundamental and saving truths of Christianity. Pastors will it a helpful book because it purely and loyally presents as over against skepticism the faith of the Church as derived from the Scriptures. It is a pleasure to us personally that it has been written by one of our own pastors who thus ably and lovingly sets forth the Christian faith.

E. P. DUTTON & CO., NEW YORK.

*In Aid of Faith.* Lyman Abbott.

There is in this volume the lucid and picturesque presentation of matter so characteristic of the editor of the *Illustrated Christian Weekly*. It is a stimulating and suggestive book, putting old truths freshly with original reflections of no ordinary character. Vigor and courage of convictions are apparent on every page, but positions are taken which are not sound in not a few instances. It has somewhat the characteristic of many modern religious books, too much reasoning and sparkling thought and too little scripture. The argument on Christian consciousness is pushed entirely too far. Christian consciousness approves truth, it does not create truth. It judges, approves and affirms the truth that comes before it, which truth is first to be sought and acquired. Hence, far more stress should have been laid upon the objective truth as found in the word of God and in the life of Christ which the Christian consciousness subjectively realizes. There is weakness in the argument on the Basis of Faith, the comparisons used are imperfect and misleading. A man may have "no ear for music." It is his misfortune, but, he is thereby freed from blame when he transgresses against the canons of musical taste. A man has no gift for the perception of spiritual truth, and hence no basis of faith, but, the conclusion is from such premises that when he does not believe in God, he is without sin and blameless. On the contrary, every man, we hold, has the spiritual nature, which is the true basis for faith on the human side, which renders him responsible. We cannot agree with the state-

ment of page 41, "the religious perception is far more common than art perception; the capacity to know, honor and love God is far more widely found than the capacity to apprehend music." All men have, or did have the faculty of religious perception.

We cannot agree with the presentation of the Atonement as set forth in the law of sacrifice. It omits the offering for sin, the satisfaction whereby "God could be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

The Resurrection of the Body is based upon deeper reasons than those rejected by the author which have caused the Church to maintain the fact whilst it does not pretend to explain the mode. The body is of God as well as the spirit.

Whoever will read the book will find it rich in thought, quickening in spiritual life and a strong bulwark against modern skepticism and materialism.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

*Upland and Meadow.* C. C. Abbott.

The present age is remarkable in this that it lives so much by proxy. The space devoted by our daily papers to athletic sports might lead a foreigner to suppose that we were very much given to the development of the muscular frame. The truth is that a few men do the playing and thousands sit on hard boards and look on. The nation is athletic by proxy. Science claims the country, but it has a few workers and the rest lookers-on. The world is scientific by proxy. It is when a delightful book like this "Upland and Meadow" appears that ordinary men discover that they are neither scientific nor even close observers. What treasures are found in the uplands and meadows of Praetguissings in the cycle of the year! Birds, toads, insects, fishes, plants and trees have each their wonders to present to their genial friend. The book is delightful, charmingly written, with quiet humor that relieves and brightens its pages. We enjoyed his little hit at the dominies, p. 36, which looks as though its cause was that some of the village ladies thought more of the parson's opinion than of his own.

A book like this is a capital book for all lovers of nature from which they might learn how to observe and to discover how many sources of enjoyment are near at hand provided by nature for those that will wait upon her and seek her as loving children.

H. L. HASTINGS, BOSTON.

*A Critical Greek and English Concordance of the New Testament.* Prepared by Charles F. Hudson, under the direction of Horace L. Hastings. Revised and completed by Ezra Abbot, D. D., LL. D. *Seventh Edition.* To which is added Green's Greek and English Lexicon. pp. 508, 208. 1885.

We rejoice heartily over the widening circulation of this genuine and

most valuable aid to biblical interpretation. With this Greek and English Concordance in hand the interpretation of Scripture by Scripture becomes a practicable and relatively easy task. The word that is obscure in one passage may readily be found in some other passage where its sense is unmistakable, and thus without the translation or commentary of others, every student may have confidence in the exercise of his own judgment and bring out the sense of Holy Writ for himself. A copy of it has been in use on our table for years, and we know of no Bible Helps for which we would exchange it. Our commentaries costing ten or twenty times the price of this little volume would all be surrendered before we would part with it.

The present (seventh) edition contains important improvements, especially in the supplement. The latest corrections of Dr. Abbot are here embodied, also a number of corrections by Dr. Caspar René Gregory, and a more legible and more thorough Greek-English Lexicon is substituted for that of Greenfield's which appears in previous editions. It is a singular merit of this book that while constantly used by scholars, as in the case of the English and American revisers, who heartily acknowledged its helpfulness to their work, it is supplied with so many convenient arrangements as to render it invaluable even to such as know not a word of the original Greek.

D. C. HEATH & CO., BOSTON.

*Colloquial Exercises and Select German Reader* for Schools and Colleges. By Wm. Deutsch, Teacher of German in the Central High School. St. Louis, Mo. pp. 261.

This is a great improvement on the average text-book for instruction in the German language. Its fundamental merit consists in the natural method which it follows. The reading matter is composed largely of simple and striking anecdotes, offering abundant material for conversation, and well suited for memorizing. It has been recently adopted as a text-book in Pennsylvania College and gives entire satisfaction to both the professor and the students.

GINN & CO., BOSTON.

*Outlines of Mediæval and Modern History.* A Text-book for High Schools, Seminaries, and Colleges. By P. V. N. Myers, A. M., President of Belmont College, Ohio: Author of "Remains of Lost Empires" and "Outlines of Ancient History." pp. 740. 1886.

This work is a continuation of the author's "Outlines of Ancient History." It presents in a comprehensive, clear and attractive form the story of Civilization from the migration of the Teutons to General Gordon's Expedition to the Soudan. In both form and matter it is admirably adapted to the uses of a text-book, as it is obviously the production of an experienced teacher. But though written for the student and the teacher we find it for general reading a most absorbing

volume. It is written in a varied style, it deals only with the essentials, and omitting tedious details it concerns itself mainly with those phenomena and institutions which are the expression of permanent tendencies and which illustrate the laws of historic development. It is positively Protestant in spirit and is characterized throughout by a healthy and stimulating as well as entertaining view of historic persons and events. We are disposed to question the truth of the brief and incidental statement made in connection with the divisions of the Protestants in the Reformation, namely, that "the Calvinists would have no dealings with the Lutherans." It has certainly been the habit of the historians—and all English historians represent Calvinistic sympathies over against Lutheranism—to condemn the uncompromising attitude of the Lutherans, who rejected all the overtures of the Calvinists for union.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

*First Healing and then Service* and other sermons preached in 1885 by C. H. Spurgeon, of London. pp. 416.

Mr. Spurgeon's sermons may not follow strictly the homiletical methods of the schools but they are signal examples of simple, practical, attractive, earnest and successful preaching. As we are stirred and strengthened by reading them, we feel a sense of envy toward those who have the privilege of hearing them from the living voice of their great author. And how cheering is the fact that thousands throng the vast tabernacle in which such discourses are delivered. Here is no clap-trap, no studied sensationalism, no outburst of irreverent humor, no slang or vulgarity to cater to the lowest tastes, but the very marrow of the Gospel conveyed in chaste, sober and strong English. If for no other reason, we would welcome these sermons for the rebuke they administer to the mountebanks who are masquerading under the guise of evangelists and revivalists in this country—and to those pastors who encourage them. In the Gospel itself, when preached by a man like Spurgeon, there is something which makes the common people and all people hear it gladly. Let our young ministers supply themselves with several volumes of his discourses and in addition to feeding their own souls with this bread of life, let them study the secret of his great power. To us it seems that each succeeding volume grows better and better.

*The Parables of Christ.* By A. L. O. E. Author of "Exiles in Babylon," "The Young Pilgrim," etc., etc. pp. 285.

Only those who possess the faculty for parables can fully appreciate and unfold the inimitable parables of the Great Teacher. This faculty in a very high degree distinguishes A. L. O. E. and the present bright little volume is but another charming and forcible illustration of it. One peculiarity about her treatment of this subject is that these brief papers having been originally written in India for the purpose of convey-

ing the Gospel to the Hindus, they are marked by an Oriental style. They show how a cultured Christian woman employs these beautiful allegories to enlighten the Heathen mind. This gives the parables a fresh interest and adds still greater richness to their meaning. The work is an excellent addition to the family and Sunday-school libraries.

PAMPHLETS.

*Communion Wine*, or the unfermented juice of the grape the most appropriate kind of wine for the Lord's Supper. By Rev. P. Anstadt, A. M. pp. 79. Teacher's Journal Office, York, Pa.

This is not only a reprint but a revision and reconstruction of the article published in the January issue of THE QUARTERLY. Its appearance in these pages created some surprise, and the editors received not a little censure for their part in the threshing of this old straw, and the raising of the blinding dust by which it was attended.

Well, the QUARTERLY is no personal organ and its editors do not require the views of contributors to be conformed to their own. We believe in free discussion and deem it better that error be published than that this right be repressed. Mr. Anstadt has made a very creditable defense of "the exploded two-wine theory" and if he has failed to produce a convincing argument in favor of it, the fault lies in the theory, not in his treatment of it. We know of no one who has done better. It is somewhat surprising that in the numerous extracts he gives in the preface from commendatory letters, he fails to give the name of the authors, in every instance except that of a Presbyterian pastor.

Since the preface admits that at least on one occasion the advocates of this view showed very emphatically their unwillingness to hear the other side, and since they must confess that they hold on to it, in defiance of the unanimous testimony of recognized scholars, let it suffice to say here that pure and harmless wine for the communion may be obtained without distorting the facts of Scripture or casting a reflection upon our divine Saviour.

We have received the v. vii. and vii. numbers of the *Hallische Nachrichten* published by Brobst, Diehl & Co., Allentown, and edited by Drs. W. J. Maun, B. M. Schmucker and W. German. Our high appreciation of the painstaking labors of the editors and of the great value of this work has been repeatedly expressed in these columns. It is not only indispensable to all who wish to be acquainted with the foundations of the history of the Lutheran Church in this country, but many pages of these narrations make wholesome and stimulating reading for those who have a mind for the spitual.

PERIODICALS.

The periodicals published by Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, New York, viz., *Monthly Magazine*, *Weekly*, *Bazar*, *Young People*, are first-class in their respective spheres. They are excellent reading matter for the household.

THE

# QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

# THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

OCTOBER, 1886.

## ARTICLE I.

### INVOCATION OF THE SAINTS.*

By REV. J. C. KOLLER, D. D., Hanover, Pa.

The subject of Article XXI. of the Augsburg Confession gives a clear and succinct statement *De Cultu Sanctorum* or *Vom Heiligendienst.* As read before the Emperor the language is as follows:

"De *Cultu Sanctorum* docent, quod memoria Sanctorum proponi potest, ut imetemur fidem eorum et bona opera iuxta vocationem, ut Caesar imitari potest exemplum Davidis in bello gerendo ad depellendos Turcos a patria. Nam uterque rex est. Sed Scriptura non docet, invocari Sanctos, seu petere auxilium a sanctis, quia unum Christum nobis proponit mediatorem, propitiatorium, pontificem, intercessorem. Hic invocandus est, et promisit se exauditurum esse preces nostras, et hunc cultum maxime probat, videlicit ut invocetur in omnibus afflictionibus. 1 Joh. 2 : 1. *Si quis peccat habemus advocatum apud Deum, cet.*"—*Müller, Symbolischen Bücher*, p. 47.

"Concerning the invocation of saints our churches teach, that the saints may be held in remembrance, in order that we may, each in his own calling, imitate their faith and good works; as that the emperor may imitate the example of David, in carrying on war to expel the Turks from our country; for each of them is a king. But the Scripture does not teach us to invoke

*Holman Lecture on the Augsburg Confession, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., June 10th, 1886.

saints or to seek aid from them. For it proposes Christ to us as our only Mediator, Propitiation, High Priest and Intercessor. On him we are to call, and he promises that he will hear our prayers, and highly approves of this worship, viz.: that he should be called upon in every affliction. 1 John 2 : 1 : "If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."—*Gen. Synod's Book of Worship.*

The phraseology of the English translation fails to bring out some few shades of meaning, found in the German and Latin texts, which are of sufficient importance to be noticed in the body of the discussion. The contents of the Article do not formally include the veneration of relics and images, neither do they specifically mention "Virgin worship," both of which are in themselves vast subjects for research, and will therefore only be mentioned in illustrating the main thought to which the present treatment is limited by the Lutheran doctrine on the worship of saints.

### WHO THE SAINTS ARE.

Although the Confession does not distinctly specify who the saints are, it is in place here to venture a brief definition, because the question in controversy has been made to turn on a correct understanding of the declaration in the Apostles' Creed: "*I believe in the communion of saints.*" The silence of the confessors has been misinterpreted. Even the saintly Claus Harms* italicised his opinion: *We have no saints.* But Carpzov† summarizes the beliefs of the early Protestants as follows: "The saints are those who once believed in God, were faithful to him, trustingly fulfilled their calling in life and are now living in heaven." This appellation is founded on the word of God and establishes that the saints are, *first*, all true Christians,‡ baptized in the name of the Triune God;§ separated from the ungodly;‖ consecrated to Christ¶ and justified by His righteousness.** To this objective characteristic there belongs, *secondly*, a sub-

*Die Augburgische Confession, 216.

†Isagoge in Libros Symbolicos, 537.

‡Rom. 1 : 7. §2 Peter 2 : 9. ‖2 Cor. 6 : 17.

¶1 Cor. 1 : 2. **1 Cor. 6 : 11.

jective qualification, namely, inner striving after holiness;* unblemished earthly citizenship;† a steady advancement in the cardinal graces of a spiritual life‡ and a perceptible increase of power over temptation,§ not implying, however, sinless perfection||. And the *third* peculiarity to be marked is the distinction between the saints on earth and the saints in heaven. They are the saints in the church militant who are found in all places where the Gospel has been accepted¶ and those of the church triumphant who have a share in the resurrection of Christ,** shall participate†† in his second coming and with‡‡ him judge the world.

Only those are denominated saints in heaven who had been truly such upon the earth; so that to the times of Irenaeus and Tertullian all who were united to Christ are known as the *hagioi.* And the confessional writings lay strong emphasis upon this fact, showing how faithfully the Holy Scriptures portray not only the virtues but also the mistakes of the saints in order to enforce the need of prudence in imitating their examples. Luther at one time forcibly insisted that the little word "*holy*" was applied by the sacred writers only to the living believer in the name of Christ and that God permitted scarcely any great saint to live faultlessly—as Moses, Aaron, Miriam, David—lest dependence should be placed in their examples and works to the neglect of God's word.§§

Doubtless the Confessors were justified in their moderate and carefully guarded opinion, for the Roman Catholic theory on what constitutes saintliness differs materially from the Protestant. Its defenders call those who belong to the visible communion "the faithful," and those of the invisible communion are "the saints."

Bellarmin is authority for the generally adopted definition:|||| "The saints are the spirits of pious men (*hominum*) who are

---

*Acts 15 : 9. †1 Pet. 1 : 15. ‡2 Pet. 1 : 5–8. §2 Cor. 7 : 1.
||Compare Pusey: Rule of Faith, 165.
¶Ps. 16 : 2, 3; Acts 9 : 32; 2 Cor. 1 : 2.
**Matt. 27 : 52. ††2 Thess. 1 : 10. ‡‡1 Cor. 6 : 2.
§§Plitt: Einleitung in die Augustana II., 436.
||||De Beatitudine Sanctorum.

released from the body and need no purgation, but are already admitted into the fruition of blessedness which consists in the clear vision of God." An analysis of this tenet, in the light of the writings and practices of its advocates, brings into prominence these points: The saints are the men and women who have professedly led Christian lives and perfectly fulfilled the will of God; who have gained superior sanctity by works of supererogation; who, after death, have power to work miracles through the instrumentality of their bones or in answer to the supplications of the distressed and *finally* who have been canonized or authoritatively placed in the ranks of saintship.* It is not maintained that the Bible sustains or justifies this theory. The Council of Trent, in formulating and defining the subject of invocation, did not pretend to cite any testimony from Christ or his apostles to designate those who are to be invoked. The most important factor is Canonization. The reverence shown to the uncanonized is far inferior to that offered to the canonized. At first it was the people—say the Christian people—who created the saints, just as it is the people now who, in their mysteriously unconscious power bestow upon some favorite ruler the surname of the "Great" or the "Good." But nothing else could be expected than that in such an act of beatification the limits of human ingenuity would occasionally be reached, and some one would attain to saintly preference whom posterity has either forgotten or who perhaps has never lived at all. The beautiful legend of St. Christopher is nothing but an allegory and has no better foundation than the pious wish, ever since the days of Ignatius, that every Christian should be a Christopherus —a *Christ-bearer*. Thus also the legend of St. George and the dragon is a noble symbol of the victory of Christianity over heathenism. These are inspiring examples; but the *Flos Sanctorum* and the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists both teem with far more sensational and legendary literature. Yet they pretend to contain only reliable history.† Carpzov pronounces the *Vitae Sanctorum* "fabulous."

Stimulated by this underground tendency to beatify and by the

*Comp. Berger: Ev. Glaube, &c., 272. †Miracles and Saints, 60.

literature growing out of it, the monks, from very early times, lived in the highest expectation of becoming saints; the common people impressed with their lives of devotion and piety silently accorded them superhuman honors; the bishops sympathizing with these manifestations of faithfulness, reported the cases to the Pope, and he, if satisfied with the life, manner of death and works, would add the sanction of his authority, and the worship would be no longer confined to a single community.*

When order and system became necessary in the classification of the faithful who had died, canonization became a prerogative of the Pope. The Roman Curia had pronounced in individual cases as early as the 10th century, but in the 12th the chief Pontiff began to exercise as his exclusive right what the reformatory councils of the 15th vigorously but fruitlessly attacked. In his jurisdiction lies the power to determine who are worthy of reverence and adoration. Hence, as Hase naively remarks he has, as in the case of delivery from purgatory, more power in heaven than on earth. No angelic or spiritual beings can prevent him from peopling the upper world with his own creatures, but the political influences and national prejudices of this world can hamper him with limitations, as for instance, when the opposition of the French and Spanish crowns forbade the canonizing of Bellarmin himself.† This is one of the unfortunate, but fatally consistent outgrowths of that doctrinal development which the great English Cardinal has so masterfully substituted "for the insufficiency of scriptural testimony." Such unwelcome interferences go far in discrediting expedients which have no firm support in the "*pillar and ground of the truth.*" But they who entrust themselves to the uncertainties of evolution must be prepared to encounter its vagaries and eccentricities. There is only One who has the right to canonize. "My Father has given them unto me."‡ "God shall exalt them."§ "I will give thee the crown of life."‖ Hence Wickliffe is moved to say: "Canonization by the pope is blasphemous, because, with-

*Neander: Ecclesiastical History, 3 : 447.

†Hase: Polemik, 301 *et seq.*, discusses canonization fully and admirably.

‡John 10 : 29. §James 4 : 10. ‖Rev. 2 : 10.

out direct revelation; no human being can be certain of any one's future state." And Luther, who is generally more concerned about the execution of his words than their elegance, exclaims: "How often may a devil be esteemed a saint and we consider those saints who belong to hell."* He would not have changed his mind if he had lived a while longer, for is not St. Raymund worshiped as a confessor on the ground of having induced the King of Aragon to establish the inquisition in his kingdom? And was not Pope Pius V. canonized,† although his hands were stained with the blood of thousands of faithful disciples of Christ, and he bribed Rudolfi to assassinate Queen Elizabeth?‡ Even Pius IX. placed in the ranks of saintship Don Pedro Arbues after he had burned hundreds of converted Jews who had been found guilty of attachment to the religion of their fathers. What possible communion can there be between these saints of the Inquisition and the saints of the New Testament! It is not a difference in *time* but *spirit.* And so radical a difference between Protestant and Catholic, as to the characteristic qualities of the true saints, will go far in determining what honor would be accorded them.

THE HONOR ACCORDED THEM BY THE CONFESSORS.

Their language is unmistakable: "Concerning the invocation of the saints our churches teach that the saints may be held in remembrance in order that we may, each in his own calling, imitate their faith and good works." The German text is a little more specific and conveys a few additional ideas.§ The doctrinal statement, though pronounced in its antogonism against worshiping the saints, is not open to the charge of disrespect for them, though Romanists have persistently put that misinterpretation upon it. A fair interpretation of the phraseology will make clear several salient points, all of which are rooted and grounded in the word of Truth.

1. The saints should be held in remembrance because thereby the honor and glory of God will be promoted. The honor

*Luther's Works, Erlangen Ed., 8 : 37.

†Very few popes were canonized.

‡Jenkins, 199.

§Mueller: Symbolischen Bücher, 47.

ascribed to them is an *actio gratiarum**—an expression of gratitude to God who works in his saints the accomplishment of his will and supplies them with an abundant measure of faith and courage. "The righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance."† Melanchthon‡ amplifies this sentiment in the Apology: "The honoring is done by thanking God for showing us examples of his grace in the lives of the saints and for supplying the church with teachers and other gifts. Now as these gifts are great we esteem them, and praise the saints who made good use of them, as Christ in the Gospel praised the faithful servants."§ Paul commends such a remembrance when he writes to the Galatians that those who praised him without ever having seen him face to face *glorified God in him.*‖ According to some of the best expositors of the Confession this remembrance does not necessarily terminate in pronouncing eulogies upon their remarkable virtues and achievements, but permits the use of pictures and images as an effectual means of recalling the history of their lives and sufferings; and it approves also of festival days to commemorate the anniversary of some notable event in their career. Luther says: "If invoking them is abandoned, pictures may be used to represent them to our eyes, just as letters are used to convey ideas to the mind."¶

2. In preserving the remembrance of the saints we obtain confirmation of our own faith. In honoring them as monuments of God's infinite love and mercy there is quickening and encouragement to our spiritual life, because they are the practical examples of human possibilities under the power of divine grace. The Apology says:** By their example we strengthen our faith. Thus, for instance, when we see that through the rich grace of God Peter's sin was forgiven after his denial of Christ, our hearts receive strength to believe that grace abounds much more than sin.†† The Scriptures also extol and celebrate the gifts of God communicated to the saints and praise the saints

---

*Walch: De Augustana Confessione, 329. †Ps. 116 : 12.
‡Müller, 223. §Matt. 25 : 21–23. ‖Gal. 1 : 24.
¶The authority is not that of the Symbols but of Luther: Guericke, Symbolik, 238.
**Mueller: Apologia, 223. ††Rom. 5 : 20.

themselves for having made good use of them. The commendation of the Baptist by the Saviour;* the eulogy of Stephen upon the Old Testament worthies;† and that grand epic‡ in the epistle to the Hebrews are striking illustrations of the confessional teaching. But in according the saints this honor the Reformers were careful to emphasize the distinction between what they called the reverence of the knee and the reverence of the heart.§ They agree with Augustine in saying: "We honor the memories of the martyrs, in order that by that celebration we may both render thanks to God for their victories and encourage ourselves to the emulation of their crowns and palms."||

3. The saints should be held in remembrance by imitating the examples they left the world while living. "Remember them that had the rule over you, which spake unto you the word of God; and considering the issue of their life, imitate their faith."¶ The language of the Confession, amended by that of the Apology gives a clear conception of the teaching: "We honor them by following their faith, love and patience each one in his own calling." As an illustration there is cited the case of the Emperor studying, in his preparations for the conflict with the Turks, the example of David as a model of imperial wisdom and courage. The apostolic fathers—notably St. Clement—called attention to this idea. In his Epistle to the Corinthians he writes: "Let us steadfastly contemplate those who have perfectly ministered to his excellent glory—Enoch for his obedience, Noah for his faithfulness, Elijah for his humility."** To these can be added the piety of Mary the mother of Jesus, Hannah's attachment to the house of the Lord, the unwearying fidelity of St. Paul, Stephen's steadfastness in the faith, and the love of St. John for his fellow-man. Melanchthon stoutly insisted that saintly intercession consisted in "the living saints praying for one another," and Hildebert of Tours, who represented the spiritual Christianity of the twelfth century, says: "The only genuinely Christian element lying at the foundation of true saint

*Matt. 11 : 4. †Acts 7 : 5. ‡Heb. 11.
§Chemnitz, Examen Concilii Tridentini, Pt. III., Cap. 3, Sec. 1.
||City of God, Chap. 8. ¶Heb. 13 : 7. Mueller, Sym. Büch., 224.
**The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I., 7.

worship is: Love among them in life.* Remembering† the bonds of the saints, ministering‡ to their necessities, holding collections§ for their benefit, emulating one another in showing them preference of place,|| bearing their burdens¶—this is the Christlike and apostolic manner of doing them reverence; or in the words of Luther,** "the right spiritual exaltation and honor belonging to the saints." Thus also pleads truthfully Cassander††—the amiable and enlightened Roman Catholic divine—in his *Consultatio* to harmonize the Augsburg Confession with the faith of the Romish Church: "*these* are the true relics of the saints, which must be imitated by the faithful, namely the examples of their godliness and virtues as found in their writings and their lives." We are reminded here of the beautiful saying of Agobard of Lyons: "Better copy the works of the living saints than invoke the intercession of the dead saints."

That a remembrance of the saints such as is authorized and encouraged by a correct understanding of the Confession, should be more faithfully advocated and observed, goes without saying. It will not involve Protestant Christendom in any superstitious practices. Why should we hesitate to pronounce eulogies over the righteous and noble souls whose faithfulness has added so much to the moral refitting of this globe? To be unappreciative of the saints on earth, to withhold from them recognition for their instrumentality in carrying forward God's purposes of salvation; to ignore them as exemplars of a godly life while present here, usually presages an excessive adulation and superstitious veneration for them after their death. How natural that is, too! Men of high religious aspirations, who have labored for the revival or reformation of religion—after having received ridicule and persecution on all sides except from a small body of homage-bearing disciples—have been apotheosized and worshiped as virtual deities after death. On the other hand a remembrance founded in the truths of God's teachings interpenetrates the heart with that spirit which humanizes all sensibility

*Neander, Ch. Hist. †2 Tim. 1 : 5. ‡2 Cor. 9 : 1.
§1 Cor. 16 : 1. ||Rom. 12 : 10. ¶Gal. 6 : 2.
**Works, Erlangen, 24 : 249. ††Jenkins: Romanism of Pius IV. 215.

and fixes the instinct of adoration upon God. It has been the universal experience of the best men that the closer one's communion with Christ, the intenser will be the feeling toward all true believers—not to worship them after death but to associate with them in life—for the consciousness of true religion, the real, living consciousness is, for one thing, the power of God working in the soul a longing after communion with the saints. In such a feeling of veneration for them there is a most salutary fascination. How natural that the eye should follow into the upper world the noble souls who were our friends in adversity, or who had been instrumental in our advancements—the old pastors, the beloved teachers of our childhood and early youth, the revered preceptors of our maturer years! Even though we do not direct our petitions to them, "they sometimes seem to be flesh again; they breathe upon us with warm breath; they touch us with soft responsive hands; they look at us with sad sincere eyes, and speak to us in appealing tones; they seem to be reclothed in living human reality, with all its conflicts, its faith and its love. Then their presence is a power, then they shake us like a passion and we are drawn after them with gentle compulsion, as flame is drawn to flame."* There is an instinctive out-reaching for their presence and helpfulness. Was it not Tinteretto who in painting a head of the Christ filled up the background of his picture with the infinitesimal heads of saints so that their watchful eyes might keep him from dealing irreverently with the sacred theme? What wonder that Luther once said:† "It was an incalculably bitter thing for me to break loose from the veneration of the saints; I was profoundly absorbed in it and completely saturated with its influence." It was not only for the sake of peace, but from a spirit of pious regard for all believers, that the early Reformers made all possible concession on this vital question of dispute. The Augsburg Interim Art. XXIV.‡ may have been somewhat *too* conciliatory in the interests of genuine conservatism: "On the remembrance of the saints we hold that they pray to God for us and help us with their service." Ground somewhat similar to this was taken by

*George Eliot never wrote a tenderer sentence.

†Works, Erlangen, 65 : 120.

‡Herzog, 1 : 612.

the Leipsic Interim. Even Melanchthon concedes that the Augsburg Confession itself may leave a loop-hole to suppose that the saints in heaven may pray for the church in general, *in genere*, with the qualifying remark, however, that such a notion has no stronger testimony in the word of God than the dream of the great Maccabean general.*

So then it is at least an error of judgment on the part of Cardinal Gibbons† when he claims "that the Reformers of the sixteenth century, in denying the communion of saints, not only inflicted a deadly wound on the Creed, but also severed the tenderest cords of the human heart. They broke asunder the holy ties that united earth with heaven, and the soul in the flesh with the soul released from the flesh." The indignant answer of Chemnitz‡ to this long exploded charge may suffice: "It is false that we dishonor the saints or allow them insufficient regard as if their remembrance were not to be celebrated. But our complaint is against the Papal Church, because she neither retains, fosters, nor demands the honor of the saints as defended in the word of God, but obscures, perverts and destroys it."

And this is not only the teaching of the Confession itself, but of all its expositors and apologists. The Church can safely afford to stand by the intepretation. Walch§ gives a list of authorities to show that the Augustana does not stand alone on this doctrinal platform. It is the general doctrine of Protestantism, the *catena* of sound scriptural teaching, the *consensus doctorum* of Evangelicalism,‖ that the saints should be held in remembrance because thereby (a) God is honored, (b) our faith confirmed, (c) and their lives ennobled.

### THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DOGMA.

But the foregoing is not the doctrine of the Papal Church. The Confession's remembrance of the saints is entirely inadequate in the estimation of Roman Catholic theologians. It did not satisfy the Confutators even proximately. Whilst they

*2 Mac. 2 : 14, 15.

†Faith of our Fathers, 190.

‡Examen, Pt. III., Sec. I.

§In Libros Ecc. Luth. Sym., Cap. 111, 329.

‖See also Guericke: Christliche Symbolik, 235, and Winer: Confessions of Christendom, 68 f.

agreed to ten articles of the *Augustana*, disputed the doctrinal tendency of seven, and partially condemned three, this one they rejected *in toto—simpliciter damnant* as Melanchthon sententiously observes. With them the *Cultus Sanctorum* was not a question of honoring the saints, but worshiping them, not of remembrance but veneration, not of commendation but adoration. They would not agree, says Walch, to the most reasonable concessions or conservative limitations. Tittman argues that they were compelled to take this stand or abandon their church. Plitt affirms that Eck charged against the evangelicals sixteen errors with regard to the saints, and would not listen to the mention of a reconciliation. A glance at the subject as elucidated and defended by such profound thinkers of to-day as Cardinal Newman, the editors of the *Dublin Review*, Cardinal Gibbons, forces any one to the conclusion that if this dogma were yielded by Romanists, the strongest link in the chain of their teaching would be broken. "The profoundest of the causes which separate the Churches lies in the Mariolatry and saint-worship of Rome; while most of the other controversies involve only the means and appliances of worship, this relates to the very object and end of it."* The question whether the saints should be religiously invoked and adored they settle with the most positive and irreversible affirmative.

1. *The Council of Trent*† in its twenty-fifth session, December, 1563, formulated the floating theories and opinions as follows: "On the invocation of saints, the holy synod enjoins on all bishops and others who sustain the office and charge of teaching, that, agreeably to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and agreeably to the consent of the holy fathers and the decrees of the sacred councils * * they especially instruct the faithful concerning the invocation and intercession of the saints; the honor paid to relics; and the legitimate use of images; teaching them, that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have re-

*Jenkins; Romanism of Pius IV., 189.

†Schaff: Creeds of Christendom, Vol. II., 199.

course to their prayers, aid and help for obtaining benefits from God through his son Jesus Christ our Lord who is our alone Redeemer and Saviour; but that they think impiously who deny that the saints who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invocated; or who assert either that they do not pray for men; or that the invocation of them to pray for each of us in particular is idolatry; or that it is repugnant to the word of God, and is opposed to the honor of the *one mediator of God and men, Christ Jesus;* or that it is foolish to supplicate, vocally or mentally, those who reign in heaven."

It will be noticed here that the assistance of the saints is a theory, not founded on the Bible—but on their imagined co-regency with Christ—*una cum Christo regnantes*—and intercessory rights; and their invocation is "good and useful" rather than necessary and indispensable. In so far the Tridentine deliverance differs from the Greek Confession* of Peter Mogila,† who pronounces prayer to the saints a *chreos*—necessity and makes Mary and the other saints a *meseteia*—mediation with God.

2. We are, however, not limited to the decree of the Council of Trent for a knowledge of the papistical understanding of this system. It receives ample elucidation in the devotional and educational books authorized by the Church. In the *Psalter of Bonaventura*,‡ for instance, we find characteristic improvements on some of the Psalms. On the I. Psalm: "Blessed they who love thy name, O virgin Mary!" On the VII.: "O most excellent lady in thee do I put my trust." On the XIX.: "The heavens declare thy glory, O Virgin Mary." On the CX.: "The Lord said unto my most excellent lady: My mother sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy foot-stool." These are a few specimens from an abundant mass of similar supplicatory addresses. The *Catechismus Concillii Tridentini*, the primer of religious instruction for the youths of the Romish communion, ascribes divine worship to the angels and apostles.§

---

*Guericke: Christliche Symbolik, 244.

†The symbolic book of the Eastern Church.

‡Chemnitz, without passing judgment on its merits, gives the most complete synopsis of this book to be found. See Examen: Pt. III., Sec. II.

§Leipsic Edition, 1851.

The *Breviary* which was prepared under a decree of the Council of Trent and sanctioned by numerous papal ordinances, though full of legends, if not offensive to good taste, morals and sense, nevertheless unprofitable,* yet acknowledged with praise by Dr. Newman,† contains a prayer‡ which ascribes equal honor to the saints with the Father and the Son. In the *Litany of the Saints*,§ as found in one of the latest missals, there is an *ora pro nobis* for fifty-one saints with specified names from St. Michael to Santa Anastasia, besides all the holy angels and archangels, patriarchs and prophets, holy apostles and evangelists, holy innocents, bishops, confessors, monks and hermits, all of whom are invited to be mediators with God even though the Vulgate itself says: "There is *one* mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus." *A Litany* of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries contains similar ascriptions—a notable one to St. Laurentius: "O thou who wast roasted alive, come, bring consolation to us miserable ones."||

3. These expressions are not repudiated but defended by the highest authorities in the Church of Rome. Pope Pius IV.¶ says: "I believe likewise that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honored and invocated." Alphonso Liguori,** who was himself canonized by Pope Gregory XVI., invoked the Virgin Mary as queen of heaven: "Save me, O powerful queen, save me by the intercession of thy son." *Gregory* XVI. closes a letter:†† "Let us raise our eyes to the most blessed Virgin Mary * * who is our greatest hope, yea the entire ground of our hope." Cardinal Newman,‡‡ interpreting saint-worship as the central doctrine of Athanasius, says: "The sanctification or rather deification of the nature of man is the main subject of his theology." And in his exposition of Father Segneri's the-

*Miracles and Saints, 79. †Development of Christian Doctrine, 411.

‡Sacrosanctae et individuae Trinitati, Crucifixi Domini nostri Jesu Christi humanitati, beatissimae et gloriosissimae semperque Virginis Mariae foecundae integritati et omnium sanctorum universitati, sit sempeterna laus, honor, virtus et gloria ab omni creatura.

§Cathcart: The Papal System, 309.

||Vilmar: Geschichte der Deutschen National Literatur, 578.

¶Cuming, 297. **Ibid, 299. ††Ibid, 301. ‡‡Development, 140.

ology he acquiesces in the opinion that "all the saints have participated sonship, divinity, glory, holiness and worship."*

4. A few instances of the practical working of the system will demonstrate how tenaciously it has taken hold of the minds of its advocates and how deeply it is rooted in their religious instincts. A refusal to adopt it incurs at least the suspicion of heresy. The Church condemns all who in any wise hesitate to accept the decree of the Council of Trent. Pope† Benedict XIV. intimates that disparaging the worship of saints is, if not a positive heresy, at least a sin of unbelief, and further says, "that whosoever shall dare to assert that the pope has erred in this or that canonization, brings scandal upon the whole church, is a maintainer of an erroneous proposition and deserving of the severest punishment." That these covered threats of excommunication are carefully remembered by the laity is manifest from the universal silence in regard to the most offensive superstitions. Some of the most conciliatory writers feign to disclaim them, but no one ventures now to discountenance them. In truth, the Romish Party in their *Confutation* of this 21st Art. of the Augsburg Confession—1530—*take pleasure* in showing that the Albigenses, Picards, and other heretics, new and old, were deservedly condemned for their opposition to worshiping the saints. Even Cardinal Gibbons‡ goes no farther than to say: "There are expressions addressed to the saints in popular books of devotion, which, to critical readers, may seem extravagant. But they are only the warm language of affection and poetry and are to be regulated by our standard of faith." But what care the devout Calabrian and Sicilian assassins and robbers for the "standard of the faith?" They join the honest peasantry and artisans who flock around the shrine of an imaginary saint and bother little about the sophistical distinctions of theorizing ecclesiastics. As late as 1872 a pilgrimage, comprising in its successive divisions two hundred thousand people, was organized in France to do homage to St. Philomena, "the thaumaturgist of the nineteeth century," and to the virgin of La Salette,

*Ibid, 435. †Mediæval and Modern Miracles and Saints, 74.
‡Faith of our Fathers, 182.

and this by sanction of Pio Nono and the secret connivance of the French government.*

Gathering information from all available sources, viewing Roman Catholic teaching on all sides, confining ourselves to its own authorities, yet remaining within the bounds of fairness and justice to a Church numbering so many millions, to which our confessors at one time belonged, we come to the following summary of its faith on the invocation of saints:

1. The saints who have departed from this life are to be religiously invoked in calamity, addressed in prayer and worshiped in the conviction of their intercessory power. "Roman Catholics do not honor the saints with that worship only wherewith we do men which excel in virtue, &c., but also with *divine* worship and honor, which is an act of religion."—*Bellarmin.*†

2. Of this adoration the saints are worthy because by their works of supererogation and superfluous merits they supplement our defectiveness, stand between the divine righteousness and human unworthiness and mitigate the severity of the one intercessor in order that we may become participants in the promises of God. "Because we believe in the communion of saints, therefore we hold communion with them in prayer, and because we pray to them they carry our prayers to God."‡—*Cardinal Gibbons.*

3. To this end all the faithful are admonished to an unwavering confidence that the beatified in heaven see, know, hear and understand all the special wishes of individuals, and the silent thoughts of the spirit, are near at hand in every moment and able to answer every petition. "Just as the mass and indulgences work for the good of the dead, so the saints through their intercessions work for the best of the living. They are in a similar way the mediators in heaven as the priests are upon the earth."—*Thomas Aquinas.*§

With this doctrine of saint-worship in Latin Christianity, agrees that of the Oriental Church. The Greeks invoke the Virgin Mary as the mother of God, the saints and martyrs as

---

*Mir. and Saints, 159. †Quoted by Pusey in Eirenicon, 107.

‡Condensed from Faith of our Fathers, 181.

§Herzog: Encyklopædie, 16 : 71.

sub-mediators, the angels as protectors and defenders, and venerate relics and images as intermediate instrumentalities in the worship of the Trinity.* On minor points there is some slight diversity but the essential features are similar. At the Council of Florence the Roman Church was willing to receive the whole body of Eastern canonized saints.

THE ORIGIN OF SAINT WORSHIP.

How did the invocation of the saints originate? A historical inquiry, so far as we have access to the most authentic sources of antiquity, invests the subject with additional interest and exhibits its tendencies in clearer light.

In the Old Testament it is unknown. Said an eminent Rabbi in a recent sermon: "Israel has never forgotten its noble heroes, nor its martyrs. It has paid them their tribute of tears and mourns them still; but it never made saints of them; it never worshiped them; never preserved their relics and worked miracles with them." "The Hebrews† were allowed to pass to heaven, or purgatory, without any apotheosis or beatification." The young King Hezekiah quickly "brake in pieces the brazen serpent of Moses,"‡ contemptuously calling it "nehushtan," when he noticed the growing signs of idolatry among the people. Like Leo and Constantine and Theophilus he would shatter into fragments anything that detracted from the supreme honor of God. The religion of the true Hebrew was founded on one grand declaration: "Hear, O Israel,§ The Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve."‖ This, according to Origen's reply to Celsus, excluded likewise angel-worship. After quoting the first commandment he says: "No one who obeys the law of Moses will bow down to the angels who are in heaven."¶

The best and most ancient authorities** maintain that the

*Guericke: Symbolik gives the original, 244.

†Edgar: Variations of Popery, 462. ‡2 Kings 18 : 4.

§Deut. 6 : 4. ‖Matt. 4 : 6. ¶Ante-Nicene Fathers, IV : 545.

**Walch mentions in his *Introductio in Libros Ecc. Lutheranae Symbol.* as valuable: Chamierus in Panstrat, Catholic, tom II, lib. 20, cap. 7 : 409. Beblius: Antiq. Ecc. Secul, tom III, Art. 7 : 980.

early Christians were strangers to saint-worship—*ab invocatione sanctorum alieni.* Chemnitz* calmly and boldly affirms that in the best and purest times of the Church, *i. e.*, of Christ and his apostles—yea even in post-apostolic times—the invocation of saints is utterly unknown—*prorsus ignota.* With this statement corresponds the universal testimony of reliable Church History. In the first and second centuries of the Christian era it was perfectly natural that the memory of those believers, who had lost their lives in the persecutions on account of faith in the Christ, should be gratefully revered. The anniversary of their martyrdom was called their birth-day and was celebrated sometimes with enthusiastic fervency. The† people assembled at the tombs of these martyrs to offer prayers to God and excite themselves to faith and patience by the solemn recollection of their virtues. Narratives of their confessions and sufferings would be read, the Lord's Supper would be frequently celebrated in commemoration of communion with the departed and the consciousness that they were resting from their labors and receiving their rewards in a conscious and continuous life with God. These observances, or *oblationes, sacrificia pro martyribus,* originally presupposed that the martyrs were like all other fallible, sinful human beings, and not entitled to any superhuman or celestial honors. That there was not the least shadow of intercession, or invocation or worship, we gather from a description of Polycarp's martyrdom‡ in the middle of the second century. In their report the congregation at Smyrna say: "Be it known that by honoring the departed we neither leave our Saviour nor worship anyone else, but love the martyrs as they deserve for their unsurpassable love to their associates and fellow disciples." Of which touching and most important account Chemnitz remarks with positiveness: That it remains uncontradicted by any ecclesiastical information from those earliest times.§

Then,|| as the consciousness of lukewarmness and growing worldliness became more and more a reality in the Christian experience of the second and third centuries, there arose a long-

*Examen Conc. Tri. Pt. 3, 398. †Guericke: Christliche Symbolik, 231.
‡Neander: 1 : 596. §Examen, Pt. III., Sec. 5.
||Kurtz: Church History, 1 : 221.

ing among the most faithful, after the piety and godly character of those who had died for their testimony to the faith. The more people declined in religious fervency the more they began to revere those who had been so far superior to them. Their memories would not only be privately treasured but transmitted to others. Memorials of them would be tenderly preserved;* their tombs would assume the nature of sanctity; their martyrdom would become more and more the season for popular celebration; the saints' days would become holidays. Thoughts upon thoughts in this line of meditation would follow: Having prayed for their fellows in life, it was unnatural that these departed would cease doing so after death. Their prayers had been intercessory in this world, why should they not be so in the next? Cyprian went so far as to ask the living to continue their intercessions for him after they had entered into their rest.† Nevertheless there is not yet the least manifestation of an invocation such as the papal dogma demands. The most rhetorical panegyrics were no more than rhetoric. Even the most pronounced opinions were only individual and private and not the public or authoritative deliverance of the Church. Not the least sign of Mariolatry had yet appeared. Pusey shows that the story of Justina "beseeching the mother of Christ to succor a virgin in peril from the assaults of satan" is without foundation. And in the "Acts of the Martyrs" there is not one genuine instance where any of those terribly persecuted confessors of Jesus asked help amidst their superhuman sufferings except from God, or our Lord. The self-confident appeals to what the advocates of saint-worship call "patristic testimony" for its justification, have no better foundation than the traditional and legendary accounts of impossible and improbable saints.§ Jerome, whose angry opposition to Vigilantius is universally cited as an insuperable defense of the invocation of saints, has not a syllable

*Mozley: Theory of Development, 25.

†Chemnitz: Examen, Pt. 3, Sec. 5. ‡Eirenicon, 108.

§See *Vitae Patrum*, a book characterized by Mr. Lecky in a note to the fourth chapter of his "History of European Morals" as "one of the most fascinating volumes in the whole range of literature."

about *invocation* but simply speaks of honoring them.* Even Origen admits that if the saints in heaven do anything for us, it is included in the divine secrets and not recorded in human transactions. Even if they do pray for us that is no reason why we should invoke them; and in his controversy with Celsus he flings the impassioned rebuke into the face of this arch-enemy of Christ: "We must offer adoration to God alone."†

And yet it is he who sowed the first seeds of what afterwards ripened into one of the most popular and tenaciously supported of papal practices. Thoroughly imbued with Platonism‡ he believed as implicitly as any of the disciples of the great philosopher, that the souls of good and virtuous men after the decease of the body, are turned into angels or good demons, and fly about the world helping men and defending them from evils and mishaps. It was an easy matter to transfer this apparently innocent belief, with unimportant modifications, to the souls of the saints and make the philosophy of Plato an integral portion of the religion of Jesus. But that which won the approbation of educated heathenism for the time, developed in the next century into opinions which threatened to destroy the knowledge of Christ.

The first unmistakable manifestations of saint-worship in its modern signification appear at the close of the fourth century.§ It then became customary to address formal and personal appeals to the departed both in prayer and the orations on festival days. Basil, bishop of Caesarea, A. D. 370, stands foremost in practically appealing to the dead. In a eulogy pronounced over the martyrdom of forty soldiers by Julian the apostate, he suddenly broke forth: "O ye united defenders of the human family; ye exalted companions of suffering; ye fellow associates in prayer; ye mighty helpers!"‖ But the Gregories quickly surpassed him in their declamatory eulogies. Nazianzen declares of Basil: "Now he is in heaven; now he sacrifices for us; now he prays for the people;" and the dead Athanasius he addressed: "But do thou look in mercy upon us from thy lofty dwelling

*Melanchthon in Apology, 223.
†Chemnitz: Ex., Pt. 3, Sec. 5.
‡South: Vol. 2 : 496.
§Chemnitz: Examen, Pt. 3, Sec. 5.
‖Bossuet-Cramer: Einleitung.

place!" Gregory of Nyssa in paying a eulogistic tribute to the martyr Theodore, cries out: "O blessed one, we implore thee to intercede for our Fatherland!"*

These are some of the causes which lie at the root of saint worship—namely the natural devotion to the memory of the martyrs—the deep longing in times of religious decadence after their wonderful attainments—the subtle influence of the Platonic philosophy on the educated mind and the growing power of superstition upon the masses. And it is of supreme significance that invocation did not obtain full sway until after the death of the church Fathers. They lived before the darkness of the middle ages obscured the pure spiritual life. Chemnitz sorrowfully laments that opposition to it ceased as the light of instruction expired and the night of superstition culminated in forgetfulness of God. After the death of Augustine the Church was delivered up, bound hand and foot, into this semi-heathenism. Peter Fullo who had been condemned by the fifth general synod, was the originator and first to introduce (470) saint-worship into the hymnals and litanies of the Church.† But it was not until the beginning of the seventh century when Gregory the Great‡ firmly and formally promulgated a new article of faith by adopting the cultus of the Virgin Mary and the other saints into the regulated public worship.

Its introduction into the Oriental Church occurred somewhat later and in the course of the iconoclastic controversies. John of Damascus had defended it beforehand on traditional grounds but it was not ecclesiastically adopted until the second Nicene§ Council in 787. And although the rise and progress of this "relic of heathenism," as some one expressively calls it, was very slow and subtle, its original germs fastening themselves in parasitic fashion on the young and vigorous growth of Christianity, nevertheless by the beginning of the fifteenth century it had enfolded the entire tree like a poison ivy striking its deadly ten-

*Bossuet-Cramer: Einleitung in die Geschichte der Welt und Religion, 4 : 341.

†Chemnitz: Examen, Pt. 3, Sec. 5.

‡Tittman: Augsburgische Confession, 126.

§Guericke: Christliche Symbolik, 245.

drils into every fiber, sucking out the life forces of pure spiritual worship and threatening to deprive it of all its fruitfulness. Milman* tells us that the saints "intercepted the worship of the Almighty Father, the worship of the Divine Son. To them rather than through them prayer was addressed; their shrines received the more costly oblations; they were the rulers, the actual disposing Providence on earth."

And yet, if Protestants are permitted to judge according to the noted rule of Vincent de Lerins, viz: that whatsoever is Catholic must be adopted *semper, ubique, omnibus,* invocation of the saints was by no means universally accepted. Epiphanius severely reprehended it and classed it among the heresies. Chrysostom† repeatedly censured the disposition of the common people to have recourse to the saints in prayer. So did many others of prominence in the Greek Church. The twenty-fifth canon of the Council of Laodicea, in the fourth century, pronounced angelolatry idolatry. Helvidius,‡ an energetic reformer of the fourth centry opposed it on the ground of Holy Scripture, reason and morality. Ambrose rejected it, in his best days, as a heathen superstition. The bitter controversy between Jerome and Vigilantius grew out of the latter's charge that to invoke the dead was ridiculous and heathenish.§ The views of Augustine—though he is claimed as a mighty defender—fairly stated, show that he thought it doubtful whether the dead, through God's power, participate in the affairs of the living; whether the saints can furnish assistance; prayers are not to be centered upon the dead, but upon the adorable and ever living God; catholic Christians adore no dead being; the apparent miracles at the tombs of the martyrs, if genuine, are the work of God; "whom shall I find that can reconcile me to God? Only the one true mediator, Jesus Christ who is my only hope."‖ And the influence of his opinions was felt throughout the later history.

---

*Latin Christianity, Vol. IV., 13, 204.

†Chemnitz: Examen, Pt. 3, Sec. 5.

‡Herzog: 5, 730.

§Herzog: 5, 692.

‖See Chemnitz, Pt. 3: Sec. 5, Chap. 3, for condensed passages from Augustine's writings.

Claudius of Turin, A. D. 820, petitioned the Emperor Ludwig to have the images taken from the churches and himself preached "like fire" against all visible mediators, admonishing the people to enter into communion with God through the one mediator, Jesus Christ.* Charlemagne (840) directed that no new saints should be catalogued for veneration.† Gundulph of northern France in the 10th century insisted that the saints had no miraculous power. Archbishop Guibert,‡ Chancellor of Emperor Henry III., vigorously wrote against it. One of the most pronounced elements of opposition on the part of all the sects in the middle ages, was war against saint worship as a corruption§ of primitive Christianity.

These utterances—manly and positive as they may be—are only the sporadic and unorganized protests of individual believers whose voices were speedily silenced by the edicts of councils, the anathemas of popes and the irresistible tendency of the increasing ecclesiasticism. It was left to the Confessors at Augsburg to frame a definite doctrinal statement against the invocation of the saints; and this they did on one insuperable and conclusive argument.

### I. IT IS CONTRARY TO THE WORD OF GOD.

"*The Scripture does not teach us to invoke saints or to seek aid from them.*" The language is brief but well chosen and decisive. In the true spirit of conciliation, they were prepared to let their case rest on this conservative utterance; but Luther the falcon-eyed leader of the Reformation was more far-seeing and gives added strength to the statement of the confessors. In the Smalcald Articles|| he says: "Saint worship is neither commanded nor advised and has no example in the Scriptures." The confutators vainly perverted "the law and testimony" to overthrow the evangelical argument. The Council of Trent does not pretend to supply any authority from God's word in support of its standpoint and Eck in his Manual for Catholic Christians expressly admits the fact, but passes it over as immaterial.

---

*Herzog, 17 : 191; Neander, 3 : 132. †Neander. ‡Ibid.
§Ibid. ||Mueller, 305.

Yet this was the impregnable fortress of the Reformers. It is a dishonor to the Church, says Chemnitz, to introduce or adopt an article of faith for which there is no safe, solid and unmistakable testimony in the canonical Scriptures; and this is of special importance in regard to prayer and worship, for here our relation to Divinity needs precise definitions. That Cardinal Gibbons considers this argument of the weightiest importance is plain enough in his attempted vindication of saintly invocation. Admitting some doubt about his reader being satisfied with quotations from the "ecclesiastical writers of the first ages" as proof of Roman Catholic teaching, he tacitly acknowledges the testimony of the Bible of essential importance. He says:† "If you have no doubt that the saints can *hear* your prayers and have the *power* and the *will* to assist you, you will readily admit that it is salutary to ask their intercessions." Then he adduces numerous texts to show that the saints hold communication with us, have the ability to aid us and are willing to exert their influence in our favor. He gives to his reasons the most plausible coloring, full of learning, wisdom and a truly Christian spirit; but there are three serious objections to his citations; and, as his are the citations upon which the Church of Rome has built whenever she attempted any scriptural defense of saint-worship, the objections to them will refute the usual appeals to divine authority in justification of this dogma. (1). Those passages which he urges with the greatest vehemence and plausibility are taken from the Apocryphal books. (2). Those which *are* canonical, do not, when subjected to the strictest rules of fair interpretation, settle his premises. (3). He cites not a solitary passage that directly commands invocation and those which positively forbid it he does not mention at all.

A brief examination of a few of these passages is demanded both on the score of fairness to our opponents and in proof of our own allegations. (1). Judas Maccabeus‡ in the night before his struggle with the impious Nicanor, in a dream beheld Onias the high-priest long since dead, standing with outstretched arms and praying for the people of God. But this book is apocry-

*Faith of our Fathers, 185. †Chemnitz, Pt. III., Sec. 3.

‡II. Maccab. 15 : 14.

phal; Judas recites a dream to animate his troops—not an actual occurrence; it is not proven that Onias was cognizant of the individual and special circumstances of the people; neither Judas nor his army had invoked Onias but the Lord God of heaven and earth.* (2). Jacob on his death bed asked the angel to bless his two grandchildren.† Therefore we ought also to invoke the assistance of created beings, reasons Romanism. But Jacob here invoked the benediction of an uncreated Being —the *Malak Jehovah*—the Second Person in the Trinity, as Luther‡ has most conclusively shown, by clearly pointing out the use of the singular verb in Jacob's entire petition, which proves that he believed the angel to be one with his father's God and the God who had shepherded him in his weary pilgrimage. (3). The fathers of the old Covenant frequently made use of the names and merits of the patriarchs in their appeals to Jehovah.§ Hence we should make similar use of the saints. But it was only and solely in God's covenant of promise to the patriarchs that these ancient people consciously reposed the guaranty of his gracious and holy guidance, hence in their prayers they did not appeal to the merits of their forefathers but to the merciful promises of the Lord.‖ (4). Numerous passages¶ are cited by the controversialists to show that intercessions should be made for all the saints. But the two men—whom no one ranks in logical and spiritual acumen to interpret the word of God—Chemnitz and Gerhard—unquestionably prove that these quotations from the sacred writers refer expressly to the prayers *of the living for the living*, and that of prayer by those who have entered into their rest there is neither an admonition or example or promise in the canonical Scriptures. (5). There was shown to the Revelator** a golden bowl of incense—*the prayers of the saints.* But these are the ascriptions of glory the saints render

*Gerhard: Loci Theologici, 27: cap. 8, page 96. †Gen. 48 : 16.
‡Speaker's Commentary, *in loco.* §An instance: Gen. 32 : 9.
‖Oehler, O. T. Theology, 66.
¶1 Tim. 2, compared with Rom. 15; Col. 4; James 5; Gen. 18 and 20; Job 42; Ezekiel 22.
**Rev. 5 : 8.

to God in heaven—*their* prayers to God, not the petitions of mundane suppliants *to them* on account of which they should be invoked, sacrifices offered to them, holidays appointed to their honor; churches, altars and monasteries erected to their exaltation. (6). God answered to Jeremiah's supplication* for mercy on the Jewish nation: "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people;" and does not that indicate God's readiness to hear the intercessions of the dead? The truth conveyed is that idolatry is such a dreadful thing that even the living presence of these great lawgivers could not save the guilty. (7). The reprobate Dives° in the place of torment could hold communication with the just Abraham in Paradise, why can there not then be interchange of thought between the saints in heaven and their brethren on the earth? And this is absolutely the only instance of intercession to a saint recorded in God's word; and it is utterly rejected; the example is not encouraging.

There is absolutely no mention in Scripture of any *examples* giving the least encouragement to invocation. On the contrary wherever celestial beings appeared upon earth all attempts at adoration were resisted. The same abhorrence shown by Paul and Barnabas at Lystra† and Peter's gentle but peremptory rebuke of Cornelius,‡ in the face of worshipful prostration, appears in the instances of attempted angelic adoration. When John fell down to worship before the feet of the angel the latter charged: "See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brothers the prophets: *worship God.*"§

Neither is there any ground of proof in favor of invocation of created beings in the case of the Theophanies which form a prominent feature in the early history of the Old Testament Scriptures and which are repeatedly cited by Roman Catholic writers to justify their system of worship. Cardinal Newman, for instance, appealing to Augustine, affirms that here is the natural introduction to the *Cultus Sanctorum*|| and the primary ground from which the development of the doctrine has arisen. He maintains that those visible appearances were creatures, no

*Jeremiah 15 : 1. °Luke 16 : 24. †Acts 14 : 15. ‡Acts 10 : 16.
§Rev. 22 : 8, 9, Vulgate. ||Development of Christian Doctrine, 138.

matter what they represented, and if so, then the patriarchs were the first who worshiped creatures, not indeed in themselves but as the token of the One greater than themselves. But is it not begging the question to affirm that these patriarchs consciously worshiped the Creator in the form of a creature? They prostrated themselves before a Presence but did they assume it to be a created presence? Did not Moses hide his face because he was afraid to look upon God? Did not Jacob say: "I have seen God face to face?" There is absolutely nothing to show that they consciously worshiped the infinite Divinity hidden under the form of a secondary divinity; for in instances of their bowing down before a supposed created presence it was after the manner of an oriental obeisance, and not an exhibition of divine worship. But even on the supposition that they had rested their worship instrumentally upon the visible presence, and spiritually located it upon the invisible, it would none the less remain true as Mgr.* Pannilini, bishop of Chiusi, pointedly says: "Worship ought not to result in the object underlying it, (or redound in it)—but be given to that object." And if there was an emphatic opposition to all idolatry in the patriarchal worship —as the Romish argument concedes—how much less ground for the least semblance for it now, since grace and truth have come by Jesus Christ.

Neither the pious appeals of Roman Catholic divines, nor the acute reasonings of the profoundest theologians, nor the infallible pronunciamentos of œcumenical councils have yet been able to answer the words of the Confessors. There is not an available sentence in the Bible, either of precept, example or promise, which they can fairly cite to favor saint-worship. On the contrary the entire system is unqualifiedly condemned by commandment, instruction and admonition. And if it be charged that Protestants in general and the Confessors in particulr argued their own opinions into the word of God, the quick rejoinder that those opinions are consistent with that Word is just as true as the historical fact that the Confutators perverted the plain teachings of holy scripture and deduced from them utterly irra-

*Jenkins: Romanism of Pius IV., 192.

tional conclusions, which, in defiance of reason and common sense, are defended as the abutments of papal authority.

*But is the teaching of Holy Scripture sufficient?* In answer to this question the Romish Church to-day produces, not officially it is true, but none the less gladly, that masterly work of John Henry Newman on the Development of Christian Doctrine. Its entire argument may be crystallized into the terse expression: "A doctrine to be catholic needs not be proven by Scripture; it is the product of the Church's life." It is implied that the sacred writings in themselves are inadequate and thus virtually admitted, on the one hand, that the early Christians were at a great disadvantage, and on the other there is demanded of us a belief in the grandest, most comprehensive and fascinating system of worship founded upon nothing substantially proven; built up after the manner of scientific hypotheses and settled by the laws of an ecclesiastical evolution! Thus, as Dr. Tulloch* happily expresses it, the author of the "development theory" and mightiest apologist for the central doctrine of Roman Catholicism, with his ardent followers, has rummaged about among the debris of ancient and mediaeval uncertainty instead of throwing the bright light of his grand intellect and the fervor of his warm heart upon the living pages of the New Testament. The development of a doctrine rooted and grounded in nothing but a traditional faith, is not a sufficient justification for its acceptance in practice. Too many intellectual leaps over unbridged chasms are needed; too many demands to enter the shadowy realms of credulity for the heart accustomed to confide in the infallible alone.

Furthermore, though there be manifest everywhere a law of development and abounding evidences of physical, ethical, ecclesiastical and theological evolution, nevertheless the idea of degeneracy has established itself just as familiarly in our minds. Growth, in its unfolding realities, strikes us as most common; so does corruption in all its disgusting forms. We see things becoming better, we also see them getting worse; and some that have been better at first have assumed sad deterioration af-

*Religious Thought in Britain in the 19th Century.

terwards. Deflections arise, and then the departure from the straight line may be insensible at first, but none the less fatal in its steadiness. No reasonable human being will undertake to frame a denial to this sure law of decadence. When Dr. Newman,* therefore, asks us to believe that invocation of the saints is a necessary development from primitive Christian worship we may respectfully ask him to prove to us that it is not a divergence from the practice of the apostles and their successors.

At any rate, what was the office of our divine Lord as the great Teacher, but that of a perfect revealer of the whole truth as to God and his worship? Whatever the Father willed to disclose to man the Son made known in all its completeness. After his resurrection the Holy Ghost assumed the revealing work and taught the apostles the same divine truth. The Lord himself had said to his apostles: "He shall teach you the whole truth, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you.† "The Church of this day can not know more than St. John," says Pusey, "else the promise would not have been fulfilled to him."‡

II. INVOCATION OF THE SAINTS DEROGATORY TO THE GLORY OF CHRIST.

From the word of God as a sufficient revelation against the invocation of saints we naturally turn to the Redeemer of mankind there revealed. The Confessors make this the next link in their argument. They say: "*The Scripture proposes Christ to us as our only Mediator, Propitiation, High Priest and Intercessor.*" In thus emphasizing the characteristic offices of the true Messiah, they ascribe to him all mediatorial glory. They can permit no subordinate, or co-mediators, as Harms§ calls them. Luther|| states incisively in the Smalcald Articles that the invocation of the saints "is a part of the abuses and errors of antichrist and destroys the true knowledge of Christ as the Redeemer;" and in one of his sermons he adds that "inasmuch as people lost their hold on Christ and thought him rude and un-

*See Canon Mozley in "Theory of Development," page 5 f.
†John 14 : 26. ‡Eirenicon, 85.
§*Mit-Mittler und Nebenmittler.* ||Mueller.

gracious, they turned to the saints, supposing that they could by their exertions soften the acerbity of him who once said: 'Come unto me all ye who are weary and heavy laden.'" And by that act they undermine the mediatorial authority of Christ and rob him of the prerogatives of his sole mediatorship.

*But there can be only one mediator.* "The redeeming Saviour, whose destiny is to restore the fellowship with God interrupted by sin, must stand on the one hand in perfect fellowship with the human race and on the other hand in perfect fellowship with God. Otherwise he can not form a bond of union between the two." Now it is inconceivable that a created being, glorified or unglorified, can stand at the same time in a relation of *perfect unity* with the human race and also in a relation of antithesis to that race, not simply because he alone in the midst of a sinful world was without sin, but because no one can come to the Father except through him. He alone is the *giver;* all others are *receivers.* The lucid unfolding of this soteriological position by Martensen* is a conclusive commentary on the declaration of St. Paul: "For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all." The glory of the only begotten one can not be understood unless we start with this conception of one God and one mediator. On this point the teaching of the Confession is so specific and so unmistakably consistent with the teaching of God's word, that the confutators involuntarily acknowledged its logical conclusiveness by coining a distinction between a mediator of redemption and a mediator of intercession, in order to justify the employment of saints and yet keep up the appearance that it is not derogatory to the honor of Christ nor inconsistent with his sole mediatorship. But there is not a vestige of any such distinction to be found in the sacred Scriptures. Carpzoz† in commenting on 1 Timothy, 3 : 5 quoted above, asserts that mediator of redemption and mediator of intercession are one and the same thing and fortifies himself by quoting the authority of Origen, Augustine and Isidore of Seville. Better yet is the authority of the New Testament. "Lord to whom

*Christian Dogmatics, 259. †Isagoge in libros, etc., 545.

shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."* "I am the way and the truth and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me."† "In none other is there salvation; for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved."‡ And that we need no other mediator requires no specific statement when we remember that Jesus Christ is both God and man,§ that he gave himself a ransom for the sin of the world|| and that the Father has accepted him as having perfectly answered the demands of the law.¶ The writings of the "Fathers" are a vast apologetic library on the all-sufficiency of Jesus Christ as the Saviour of mankind. And the deepest soul longings, the purest consciousness of realized salvation, as recorded in sacred song, constitute unceasing testimony to the saving power of the Son of God. What a mass of Christology and truly precious soteriology in our best hymns! "Thou, O Christ, art all I want." "Light, riches, healing of the mind, Yea, all I need in thee I find." "Jesus, my Advocate above, my Friend before the throne of love." "Thou must save and thou alone."

If there is one essential more completely fortified in Scripture than another it is this one of our salvation being possible solely and entirely on the merits of the God-man. He is the propitiation for our sins. "Truly in the Lord our God is the salvation of Israel."** "If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." Upon this one passage the Confessors rely for the confirmation of their doctrine.

But invocation of the saints presupposes their *intercessory powers.* This is indeed the central position of the doctrine so far as it touches the work of the Redeemer. So diametrically opposed to each other are Protestantism and Catholicism at this point that when the former says: "The Israelites of old had no clear knowledge, as we have, of one great mediator, who is making intercession for us, *and yet* they sought not the good offices of the superhuman beings of whose existence they had no doubt, the latter replies *and therefore*†† they made no appli-

*John 6 : 68. †Ibid, 14 : 6. ‡Acts 4 : 12. §John 8 : 58; Matt. 16 : 13.
||Matt. 17 : 5. ¶Rom. 3 : 25 and 1 Jno. 4 : 10.
**Jeremiah 3 : 23 and 1 Jno. 2 : 1. ††*Dublin Review*, Mar. 1883, 55.

cation to them for aid." They knew so little of Christ *and yet* did not call upon the spirits of the departed, say the Confessors; the Confutators answer because they knew so little of him *therefore* they failed to invoke those who had been saved by faith in his name. The Augsburg Confession teaches that there is only one intercessor on whom we are to call and he promises that he will hear our prayers. He should be called upon in every affliction. The dogma of Rome is that angels and the saints, at whose head is the Virgin, intercede for us, and being able to hear and answer our petitions "it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them and to have recourse to their prayers." Romish dogmaticians in unfolding and enforcing this proposition as an indispensable part of their cultus, appeal to three very important considerations.

1. *The divine method of governing the universe.* With much earnestness and some plausibility it is argued that just as the Father in his creative and providential capacity employs the laws of nature for the administration of his purposes, so in the administration of his moral purposes he employs the agency of angels whom he has created as his ministering spirits. And just as Jesus uses the sacraments which he himself has instituted, and the prayers of the Church militant to promote the edification of the faithful so he employs the intercessions of the church triumphant for their protection in calamity. "Who can doubt," asks the Roman Catechism, "that the saints take upon themselves the work of our defence, when he beholds the miracles wrought at their graves, the blind having received their sight, the lame healing, the dead brought to life, and devils expelled from their bodies?"* The analogy is not well taken; if the reasoning were conclusive we might inquire whether our prayers for temporal blessings should not be addressed to the laws of nature, inasmuch as our petitions for spiritual blessings are to rise to the angels and the saints. But the dishonor to Christ involved in such a pantheistic worship is not its only objection. Aside from its uselessness there is the reflex injuriousness arising from all selfish devotion. The heart which is for-

*Berger: Evangelischer Glaube, 273.

ever crying after blessings is not the heart in which dwells the Saviour formed the "hope of glory." And although these saints and angels are "ministering spirits," whereas the laws of nature are but "blind forces," both are equally the messengers of God and *He* is to be invoked for their intervention—the agent not the agencies.

2. *Human sinfulness as against Christ's holiness* makes the intercessions of the saints necessary. Our sins render us very unworthy to come immediately to Christ himself who is unreconcilable because of his immaculate purity, terribly displeased because of our transgressions. Luther attributed to this most foolish and erroneous notion the dreadful tenacity and commercial value saint-worship assumed in his day. People in their God-forgetfulness stood in terror of the judgment and readily consented to pacify some tutelary inter-mediator to gain the benefits of his intercessions. The utter unreasonableness of this argument ought to make an appeal to the word of God unnecessary. Yet, does not Christ know them whom he invites and commands to come to him?* "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name that will I do."† "Who is he that shall condemn? It is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."‡ Indeed the entire Epistle to the Hebrews is a most precious demonstration that Jesus is the compassionate High Priest, capable of entering into intensest sympathy with every one. The Romanist maintains that the concern of his saint for him intensifies when he is translated from the here to the afterward, but the love of Him who rescued that saint is chilled by his ascension into heaven! We have not so learned Christ. "I will not leave you comfortless. I will come to you."§

3. *The incarnation of Christ* is regarded among Catholics as the invincible argument in favor of the *Cultus Sanctorum.* Christ is the God-man. The son of God became the son of man. The divine entered into union with the human and by virtue of this union the human partakes of at least certain com-

*Matt. 11 : 28. †Jno. 15 : 16. ‡Rom. 8 : 34. §Jno. 14 : 18.

municable qualities of the divine. As the divinity has become incarnated into the human nature so the humanity has become implanted into the divine, hence there is a divine humanity at the head of which stands the second person of the Trinity—the living bond of inter-communion between God and the redeemed race. All the saints are therefore constantly with him and participate in his activities. The entire host make out a sort of halo about him; each one partakes of the instinctive omniscience of Christ; wherever he goes they go; whatever he does they do; on earth infirmity clung to them; on high their being is made perfect, and they carry freely out that great part which here below they but rehearsed, and when the Scripture says: "The Spirit maketh intercession for us," the meaning is the host of saints is praying for us, for the spirit is the life of the Church.*

The charge against Protestants is ignorance of the meaning and logical tendencies of the incarnation. If they understood the vast significance of this transaction they could not help but join in directing their supplications to the dead in Christ and make that a fundamental doctrine of Christianity.

The thought demands sober treatment, reserved, if critical; reverent, if bold; "for nothing which has ever interested humanity or profoundly moved it, is treated with contempt by a wise and good man."† The difficulty lies not in denouncing the assumption but in apprehending it; disputants who are more intent on assailing others than defending themselves will rather make loop-holes for the enemy than a way for their own escape. *Audi partem alterem.*

The profound importance of the incarnation on the cultus of the saints can not be belittled with a sneer. Doubtless much of the Bible notion of man's relation to God has been obscured by theological bias. Thus the Johannic immanence of God has been obscured by the Agustinian transcendence. But the theology which removes God to an infinite distance from man does not harmonize with the philosophically and *humanely* fascinating thought of Scripture that God is very near at hand—in whom we live and move and have our being.

---

**Dublin Review*, Mar. 1853, 44. †Tulloch: 19th Century, 9.

But what is more to the point is, that if the incarnation of Jesus implies an incarnation in the case of every believer, even in a limited sense, then Christianity is analogous to Buddhism* which teaches unlimited incarnations,—for every celebrated teacher is a Buddha. Probably the advocates of the invocation theory would not deny this inference since the infallible church has enrolled in her martyrologies the two oriental (mythical) saints, Josaphat and Barlaam, though Max Mueller† has shown that they are identical with Sakya-Mouni, the divine founder of Buddhism, and one of his apostles.

Nevertheless Möhler answers: "They who would worship Christ, must invoke the saints," on the supposition that He dwells in them. And at the head of the great host stands the Virgin Mary—the mirror of purest womanhood, as says St. Ambrose, the impersonation of all virtue * * * the celestial exemplar of all grace, the *Theotokos*—mother of God. Protestants do honor her above all in the ranks of womankind; they allow her all legitimate exaltation; in no sense are they reluctant to sound the praises of the "Madonna who bore the child." To them she is a nobler ideal than to hosts of her worshipers. For, do her Roman Catholic devotees venerate her piety, or renunciation of the world, or charity, or self-sacrificing devotion as a woman and a mother? By no means; but because she is supposed to be capable of miraculous power, there is this lofty adoration. Who is the Madonna in that Church to-day? Is it the lowly virgin who said: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy Word?"‡ Is it the silent, self-renouncing, willingly obedient mother of the Redeemer as she is painted to us in the Gospel of St. John? Is it her pious earthly life which all their representations portray? Not at all. The Madonna is invoked for her ability to protect and her special intercession with the son of God. An impartial study of this Virgin-cultus leaves the indelible impression that the mother is greater than the Son, capable of more efficient sympathy, quicker to hear and answer prayer and a mightier

---

**Andover Review*, Mar. 1886, 310.

†*Contemporary Review*, July '70, 580. See also Miracles and Saints, 44.

‡Luke 1 : 38.

and more intimate friend and helper. This is the logical sequence of the Romish treatment of the incarnation. Adopt its conclusions, especially that it virtually deifies whosoever is baptized into Christ, and you will be compelled to admit one of the most potent arguments in favor not only of Mariolatry but hagiolatry in their unconditioned signification. That is to say, *in calamities*, which are the expressions of God's anger, the people must get near to some one who is close to God and has influence with him—close to some one of the secondary intercessors. Even Dean Stanley traces back the longing after communion with some one near the great Invisible, to the passion, the vehemence, the urgency of some great sorrow like that of the French Christians in the fifteenth century uttering their piteous supplications for deliverance. The reply of Canon Liddon* is sufficiently forceful in its conclusiveness: "Sorrow of itself does not make the prayers which it multiplies or intensifies, either lawful or availing. Sorrow may quicken the instincts of superstition."

But even here the Scriptures must remain the legitimate argument. Belief in the intercession of the saints is an evidence of unbelief in the complete and all-sufficient intercession of the Lord Jesus himself. Even in the darkness of the ninth century Agobard of Lyons† said: "Since no man is essentially God, save Jesus our Saviour, so we, as Scripture commands, should bow our knees to his name alone lest by giving this honor to another, God may consider us estranged from him." "He ever liveth to make intercession for them."‡ "And thus saith the Lord.§ Cursed is the man that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm and whose heart departeth from the Lord." Such denunciation of all unauthorized reliance upon human beings and their religious veneration was loudly applauded in the early church. Tertullian|| asks: "Who permits you to accord to man that which has been reserved for the Deity? The martyr has enough to do with his own deficiencies. Who but the son of God has delivered another from the power of death!" And

*Bampton Lectures, 1866, p. 528.
†Neander, 3 : 429.
‡Heb. 7 : 24, 25.
§Jeremiah 17 : 5.
||Carpzov, 540.

Augustine: "Make no religion of the worship of dead men, for, if they lived piously, they look not for such an honor, but want us to honor Him through whom they are able to rejoice in the light of truth." This decided opposition, little regarded by the ecclesiastical powers, but continued for many centuries, proves that pious Roman Catholics preferred to trust themselves immediately to the intercession of Jesus rather than to the intermediary prayers of the saints. The ingenious German poet, *Angelus, Silesius,** though he had renounced the Protestant Church, nevertheless cries out:

> "Weg, weg, ihr Seraphim! ihr könnt mich nicht erquicken!
> Weg, weg, ihr Heiligen! und was an euch thut blicken.
> Ich will nun eurer nicht: ich werfe mich allein
> Ins ungeschaffne Meer der bloszen Gottheit ein."

And what is of equally serious consideration, the invasion of the prerogatives of Christ's mediatorial office by the admission of these numberless intercessors introduces an element of uncertainty into our own relations with Christ. The seeker after grace and wisdom and strength knows precisely whither to turn when he is conscious of only One almighty deliverer and is unhampered by a multiplicity of inferior objects of worship. He need listen to one voice alone: "Come unto me." But who among the subordinate mediators is the one most likely to hear his supplications, St. Ann or St. Michael? Confusion and embarrassment must distract his worship and rob him of the assurance of faith. Erasmus relates that a suppliant whose tutelary saint was Nicolaus, and who, during a shipwreck, when in the most threatening danger each one was calling on his particular patron defender, feared that his own saint would either not hear his pressing petition (the ship was already sinking) or had to pay attention to others who were invoking him at the same time, or might not speedily enough obtain audience of God, turned away from him and offered his petition directly to the only Saviour.† Admit that this is but mockery. Is there not terrible significance in the incident and does it not speak incontestibly for itself? Wickliffe‡ saw the subject in the same light: "The devil may work in the pretended saints.§ The soul becomes

*Hase, 306.
†Tittman: Augsburgi Confessio, 128.
‡Neander.
§1 Tim. 4 : 1.

distracted by the multitudes of saints who are recommended for invocation. It may likewise turn out that the foolish devotee is worshiping a canonized devil." And Luther asks: "Why will you forsake the safe and certain and worry with that which has neither merit or necessity or command?"* And does not this uncertainty grow into a crime when we consider the perilous loss of time which such indirect devotion involves? Every member of the Church of Rome claims that all our direct worship and service belongs to God and his Christ; but where, amid the few fragments of time allotted us on earth and our manifold engagements, shall even the most devoted Christians find time to divide their devotions between the direct and indirect.

Here we may stop long enough to emphasize the irresistible conclusion that invocation of the saints is *illogical, unnecessary, and useless.* It has no solid foundation in reason. Being contrary to the contents of the divine revelation it must stand in conflict with the enlightened and unprejudiced understanding. The laws of thought and promptings of the heart contradict its claims. The God who speaks in his word speaks also in his rational creations. And that it is unreasonable to demand our worship for those creations after their transition into the unseen world, must be manifest from their very nature. The saints in heaven differ in no vital particular from those on earth as concerns their attributes. Canonization even can not communicate to them any extra endowments, can not remove external and internal obstacles, can not remedy the essential limitations. Romanism without giving the proof, asserts that it can; Protestantism replies it can not because the Bible nowhere gives the least intimation of any such a prerogative or of any added rights and powers after death. Have the saints any knowledge of our circumstances? This involves the question of their omniscience and omnipotence, at least ubiquity, perpetual cognizance, hearing prayer, reading the heart.† They are either in possession of these divine attributes or they are not. If they are not, then worshiping them is the baldest and most useless superstition. True the Council of Trent conditions the promulgation of this dogma on the abandonment of all superstition

*Works, 53 : 139. †*Dublin Review*, 1853, p. 48 f.

but remains shrewdly silent as to what manifestations of superstition are intended.

But Romanists* insist that the saints do possess all the necessary attributes for intercommunication with the faithful; they know all about us; distance is but an accidental interruption; space can not interfere in intellectual communication; it is absurd to suppose that matter can constitute any obstacle to spiritual communication between earth and heaven. The blind man can not see his friend but that does not imply that his friend has lost the power of seeing him. If however the blind man knows anything he is conscious that his friend can see him without the power of seeing all things and be present with him without being everywhere present. It is easy enough to see that the Romish reasoning rests on probabilities, and the principle of probability doubtless plays an important part in many a man's religion; but this is no more than a process of "make believe," as Tulloch characterizes the theory of Newman and his followers. Only assent strongly to anything and the power of intellectual creativeness may in time project it as a reality to the vision of the credulous. Does not my friend of whom I have heard nothing for twenty years pray for me any more? Granted he does; but *what* special petitions does he offer in my behalf? My circumstances are entirely changed. Does not my father who died when I was a lad of fourteen, intercede for me any longer? But how shall he know the present character of my environments, which he must know if his intercessions are to have any practical efficacy? Praying *in general* is not the key-note of this system of worship. Protestants readily admit that the saints are in a conscious state of existence, and that the departed in the church triumphant belong to the same mystical body with those in the church militant, but that the spirits of the dead are accessible to those of the living, capable of hearing their prayers, knowing their thoughts, and answering their requests, they can not admit as a reason to invoke their intercession *unless it be unmistakably demonstrated by divine teaching.* Even Cardinal Cajetan admits that "we have no certain knowledge as to whether

*Milman, History of Christianity: Book IV, 426.

the saints are aware of our prayers."* Prayer to them is an act of worship, but an untramelled and unbiased heart demands a distinct revelation or an express injunction for such an act of worship. The soul does not want to be launched out on an ocean of follies and phantasies. Why should any one leave the known for the unknown? There is a profound reason in the prayer of that German unbeliever: "Oh God, if thou art, reveal thyself unto me!" It is God's nature to reveal himself to his pleading children. But for how many centuries already have devout saint-worshipers fruitlessly cried to some departed one for only a word from the unknown. The eternal silence remains unbroken. "And Elijah said unto Elisha, Ask what I shall do for thee BEFORE *I shall be taken away from thee.*"† The eyes of King Josiah were *not to see* the evil coming upon his nation.‡ "Thou art our father though Abraham be ignorant of us."§ Says Winer: "If the Romanists are misapprehended they are themselves to blame,"‖ for in defining their positions they use words which imply everything Protestants charge against them. And the subterfuges,¶ to which the Roman clergy are compelled to resort, to show how the saints may become cognizant of the wants and wishes of men, is a virtual confession on their part that nothing is known or can be known in regard to their status in the unseen world.

III. SAINT-WORSHIP DEGRADES THE SPIRITUAL WORSHIP OF GOD.

"And this," the Confession says, "is the loftiest worship according to the word of God." Consequently, the invocation of the saints infringes on the divine attributes, is subversive of the supreme authority of God and undermines the necessity of spiritual worship. In the formulation of systems of worship all orthodox churches agree that adoration belongs to God alone. "But as the Catholic and Greek churches in all formal elements of their doctrinal system have ranged the human side by side

*Quoted from his Secund. Secundae by Jenkins On Romanism, 194.

†2 Kings 2 : 9. ‡2 Kings 22 : 20. §Isaiah 53 : 16.

‖The Confessions of Christendom, 68.

¶Dr. Hodge discusses these fully in "Systematic Theology," Vol. III, p. 283.

yea exalted it above the divine in revelation. So in this special part of their cultus, they substantially present a human element for worship in the religious veneration they accord to the Virgin Mary, saints, images and relics."* The deliverances of the church on this subject virtually concede that it is not necessary to worship God alone. The Council of Trent impliedly pronounces refusal to invoke the saints a heresy, and the Protestant precept that God alone must be worshiped, a sin. But Justin Martyr† asks Trypho: "Do you think that any other one is said to be worthy of worship and called Lord and God in the Scriptures except the Maker of all, and Christ who by so many scriptures was proved to you to have become man?" And Theodoret tells us that "To Him alone who is God we must bring our worship." How these early Fathers bind all their thoughts to the revealed thought of God! But no wonder, for Christ condemned Samaritanism solely on the ground of trying to be independent of revelation. The advocacy of saint-worship rests on the same independence of divine teaching. We know what we worship; they think they know.

*This is nothing less than an invasion of the unity and supremacy of God* and an infringement on his attributes. That it was so understood by the Confessors is seen in their opinion that invocation of the saints was antagonistic to the first article of the Confession. How could that article stand, they ask, if a multitude of beings ranged themselves between the believer and God. Of course these Confessors were only fallible men, the adversaries charge, who constructed this doctrinal standpoint upon their own perverted theology. Let it be admitted that in according to the *Augustana* its rightful place we need not sanction everything its indiscreet admirers and indiscriminating laudators have written. If it is *not* a pyramid—its foundation article, the Trinity and its capstone, true worship; it is nevertheless a living organism, a colossal, pyramidal oak—its main stem the one grand thought, God in Christ working by his Spirit and all the other articles naturally and rationally growing out of that, branch-

*Guericke, 230. †Ante Nicene Fathers, I, 232.

like—and all these the essential evolutionary outflow from the *Truth*, eternal, self-existent, absolute, as the tree itself grows from the ground in all its beauty and majestic stateliness. When it speaks here it only reiterates the declarations of God's word which tolerates no divided worship. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."* "The Lord thy God shalt thou fear and him alone shalt thou serve."† Here is no room either for image-worship or hagiodulia. Chemnitz‡ concedes to this argument the very first importance. "All the heathen methods are false and vain; they are so because it is impossible without the word of God and by the light of natural reason alone to understand true worship. Hence it is a most extraordinary and indescribable blessing of God that he has revealed in his word how he wishes to be invoked, and what kind of invocation is acceptable to him." What then is worship? What is Christian worship? Schleiermacher defines it thus: "The sum total of all actions whereby we present ourselves as organs of God by means of the Holy Spirit; it embraces all the virtues so far as manifested in the dominion of the spirit over the flesh."§ Wuttke: "As believing is taking up into our moral consciousness the ever present divine, so worshiping is elevating our moral consciousness to God."‖ To which Köllner adds: "Unconditional confidence in God and the thankful recognition and acceptance of his mercies."¶ This definition precludes the very thought of intrusion from any outside claimant; it implies omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, infinitude in all things as belonging to the object of worship. And as the Roman Catholic includes in his Cultus the Trinity with all the saints, he means to render the elements of worship to all alike, no matter how rigorously he pleads for a distinction between superior and inferior reverence. Herbert in his beautiful poem, "To all the Saints and Angels," after acknowledging the tempting fascination of adoring them and paying loftiest tribute to the blessed Maid, breaks forth:

> "But now, (alas) I dare not; for our King
> Whom we do all joyntly adore and praise

---

*Exodus 20 : 5. †Deut. 6 : 13. ‡Examen Con. Tri., Pt. III, Sec. III. §Wuttke: Ethics I, 369. ‖Ibid II, 215. ¶*Symbolik der Luth. Kirche.*

Bids no such thing:
And where His pleasure no injunction layes,
('Tis your own case) ye never move a wing.
All worship is prerogative, and a flower
Of his rich crown, from whom lyes no appeal
At the last houre.
Therefore we dare not from his garland steal
To make a posie for inferiour power."*

In this brief poetic offering there is concentrated the substance of divine teaching. Moses† cries out: "Thou, O Lord, art my refuge," to which St. Ambrose‡ answers: "Thou alone, O Lord art to be invoked." David§ rejoices to sing "The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon him," and St. Basil|| replies: "Prayer is directed not to man, but to God only." Asaph¶ hears God say: "I will deliver thee and thou shalt glorify me." St. Ephraim** rejoins: "To thee and none besides thee do I make my petition." To Isaiah†† God says: "I am the Lord; that is my name and my glory will I not give to another neither my praise to graven images." "And this knowledge," maintains Origen,‡‡ in his argument against Celsus, "will not permit us to pray with confidence to any other than the supreme God who is sufficient for all things, through our Saviour the Son of God." "We dare not worship those who are themselves worshipers."

But to this representation of our relation to the one supreme and all merciful Being, the advocate of invocation of the saints rejoins: "Just as in approaching a monarch we need the good will of his courtiers and intimate associates for permission to enter his presence so we need the heavenly beings around the King of Glory to carry our petitions into the sacred presence." "Whence have we," asks Spiel, "the great confidence in the intercession of the saints, but in the untold assurances that our prayers have been heard." So then our heavenly Father would not have heard them if it had not been for these intermediate iufluences by which they came to the ear of the Almighty!§§

*Prose and Verse, 75. †Ps. 91 : 9. ‡Jenkins, 195. §Ps. 145 : 18.
||In libello Maron. ¶Ps. 50 : 15. **Homilies. ††Is. 42 : 8.
‡‡Ante-Nicene Fathers, 4 : 544.
§§And yet Bellarmine shows that God makes known our wants to the saints, so they may pray for us.—*De Sanc. Beat.*, cap. XX, 735.

It will be remembered that heathen philosophy urged the same reason for the invocation of the Olympian gods*—that they should be Jupiter's courtiers and introduce his votaries. St. Ambrose in his exposition of the first chapter of Romans and St. Augustine in the eight chapter of the City of God antagonize this heathenism of saint-worship.† Besides, here is brought to light the weakness of this entire system of creature-worship which represents God as an unapproachable potentate whose clemency can be secured only through the recommendation of some favorite, and not of himself immediately. Have we not access to God through his son Jesus Christ and is not this the distinctive privilege of all Christians? The restoration of this gospel was the first work of the Lutheran theologians. How then will application to the saints appear to the saints themselves but an unpardonable derogation from the glory of Christ. And what will God himself think of such court trickery as that! Even an earthly monarch, who had appointed his own son as the sole means of access to himself and as the direct dispenser of his pardons and graces, would feel that recourse to the servants of his household or to any indirect method of approaching him would be a very grave affront.‡ Can we think less highly of God and his Son as our only revealed intercessor in whose name we are to bring our supplications and thanksgivings to the throne of grace? "This is the Christian religion that no one should be worshiped save the one God, because no one makes the soul blessed save the one God."—*Augustine.*§

But furthermore, rendering worship to beings inferior to the triune God opens the way for a *Christianized Polytheism*, the utter extinction of which God was seeking in all ages of the world. In a professedly monotheistic religion it supplies the polytheistic wants of the soul. Before people know the true God they long after gods; their souls reach out for a substantial answer to the consciousness of indestructibility. There is a twilight of immortality in every rational being. But what shall bring the perfect light of day? Before the sun of righteousness arises, the dimly glimmering stars of great heroes must answer.

---

*Hase: Polemik, 310. †Chemnitz: Ex. Conc. Trid. Pt. III., Sec. 4.
‡Jenkins: Romanism of Pius VI., 193. §Vera Religione, cap. 55.

Something must fill up the vast distance between humanity and divinity. There is, therefore, a tendency in the human heart to create arbitrary objects of worship according to the lust or the fancy of the worshiper. The purest element of heathen theology is the deification of intellectual and moral attributes—manliness, purity, devotion, unstained truthfulness, courage, bravery, fortitude. Then it is easy enough to transfer these abstractions to concrete realities and personify one or the other in some separate human being. Hence the multiplication of the *Divi* among heathen peoples. In the paganizing periods of Christianity it was but natural to imitate the heathen custom. Melanchthon explains that from heathen examples the multiplication of saints arose. Some building in Rome which had at first been erected by Agrippa to the avenging Jupiter and his satellites was afterwards rededicated by the Roman bishop to Mary and all the martrys; the ancient Roman Pantheon became the modern Christian Pantheon; the saints were considered Christianized heroes and semi-deified human beings in precisely the old heathen style. In the *Libri Carolini* beatification is made identical with deification—canonizing "the faithful" the same thing as elevating the emperors to the position of *Theoi.** Canonization is only another name for apotheosis. With only this difference: In the latter case it was the exaltation of the emperor to the gods, in the former the elevation included the humblest and poorest who had been washed in the blood of the Lamb and whose lives had been adorned by Christian virtues.†

Mantuanus observes that just as the Latins invoked Mars to aid in military enterprises; Castor and Pollux to take knight errantry under their patronage and Juno to be the protectress from fevers, so Saint Anna is a refuge in storms, Sabastian from pestilence, Florian from fire; Saints George and Martin are the tutelaries of the Germans; Saints Paul and Peter of the Romans. As the custom of calling upon the patron saint grows in practice the worship of Jesus falls into the back-ground if not entire neglect. And that this assertion is not a perversion of the facts is plain enough from the numerous instances of which the following are examples. A Tyrolese mountaineer placed

*Neander. †Hase: Polemik, 310.

this inscription over the door of his house: "Holy Florian defend this house from fire." And a citizen of Vienna painted on the gable of his dwelling: "This house stood formerly in the hand of God; he allowed it to burn away; now it is committed to St. Florian's care." If these examples seem somewhat ordinary and ludicrous, as Hase facetiously intimates, then the fact that Francis of Asissi praised the legend: "My saint hears whom *God does not*," borders on the sacrilegious. Yet this is the inevitable consequence of placing a creature before the Creator. Pure monotheism cuts the roots of all polytheizing tendencies. Is there any unfairness in thus stating the case? Suppose that on some morning when all the worshipers had left the cathedral a monotheist from some other sphere should quietly enter it, pick up the prayer book and see the *ora pro nobis* to scores of beings with human names, should see in the pictures which adorn the walls the figure of a crowned woman with a child in her arms and prostrate penitents about her, should examine the marble statues on all sides with evidences of superhuman reverence being paid them, what would be his reflections? The pagans and Manicheans reproached the saint-worshipers centuries ago for deifying human beings. Until the 9th century the churches had only one altar. But the learned papal bishop Nicolas of Cusa accused the Italians of substituting saints for the old Latin gods.

Possibly the Arian controversy is indirectly responsible, in part at least, for this polytheizing tendency in worship. The divine of the Saviour's personality was exalted at the expense of the human. The idea of the *God-man* was too much lost sight of in the attempted identification of his nature with the unseen and incomprehensible Deity. Hence Christ became the object of a remoter, a more awful adoration. Says Milman:* "The mind began to seek out, or eagerly to seize some other more material beings in closer alliance with human sympathies. The constant propensity of man to humanize his deity, readily clung with its devotion to humbler objects. The weak wing of the common mind could not soar to the unapproachable light in

*History of Christianity, Book IV, 425.

which Christ dwelt with the Father: it dropped to the earth and bowed itself down before some less mysterious and less infinite object of veneration." What then? Is the weakness of faith in the only true God and the slovenliless of materializing propensities an excuse for turning away from the Supreme Ruler and fixing the heart's devotions upon the works of his hands? They who would remain faithful to the ancient creed of the Christian Church in every age dare not divide their worship between the Creator and the creature. Says Dante:* "Invoking the saints is false worship. In Christ alone is our salvation." "And when thou prayest thou shalt say: Our Father who art in heaven." "The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon him."†

3. *If they divide their worship they become guilty of idolatry.* To this conclusion we are reluctantly but inevitably driven by a scriptural, rational and practical study of this subject. It is noteworthy to remark that the Confessors in the true spirit of conciliation at first hesitated to press the charge of idolatry against Rome, but in the later symbols, the growing superstition is severely handled. The Apology in discussing the belief in special saints as the patrons of certain civil employments and avocations calls it a "shameful heathen lie"‡ and in the Smalcald Articles the entire practice of invoking the saints is declared to be "idolatry."§ Much stronger language is used at other places but nothing in the Lutheran symbols can compare with the expressions employed in the Helvetic and Gallic Confessions. Indeed, Calvinism allows hagiolatry no ground of justification whatever and calls it a deception of the devil.|| Neander states that here is to be found one of the causes of the rise of Mohammedanism—the original adherents considering Mariolatry equivalent to idolatry.

In view of such facts and others, numerous attempts have been made by Rome to modify and explain the nature of this fundamental element of its system. The explicit statements of God's word, forbidding even the faintest and apparently inno-

*Neander. †Ps. 145 : 18. ‡Mueller, Sym. Bücher, 229. §Ibid, 305. ||Gall. Conf., Art. 24. See also Zöckler, 172; Hase, 307 and Guericke, 239.

cent manifestations of a depreciated worhip of God; the positive denunciations by the apostolic and early church fathers against polytheistic tendencies in prayer; the rigorous opposition on the part of pious and influential Catholics against the introduction of intermediate objects of veneration and the disastrous practical consequences, all have had more or less influence with Rome in vindicating the "invocation of the saints." Indeed it has become necessary for the clergy to apologize for it and extenuate its results rather than set up a practical defense. This is especially true in regard to the charge of idolatry.

Conscious of the justice and seriousness of this imputation the Roman Curia has given the name of *relative* or *indirect* worship to this cultus, a worship which will begin with inferior but ultimately terminate in God as the final object of adoration. It draws the subtle distinction between the worship of God and that of the saints by pointing out the infinite interval between the saints and the King of the saints. Bellarmine* receives the credit of amplifying and officially formulating the differences which Augustine is believed to have originated in his rules on "reverencing the martyrs." Three degrees of worship are specified: first, *doulia* that which is an inferior kind of worship and due to the saints and angels; it is more than human and less than divine; secondly, *hyperdoulia*—a word of comparative recent coinage to describe the nature of the veneration to be shown to the Virgin Mary, a form of worship loftier than the *doulia;* and thirdly, *latria* which signifies supreme worship and is applicable to God alone. Augustine calls the first of these forms *civil worship—cultum civilem sue cultum charitatis ac societatis* and the latter he calls *religious worship*, *cultum religionis*, and maintains that all forms are *per majorem gloriam Dei.*†

But there is not sufficient clearness and force in these theoretical distinctions,—the ordinary mind will not grasp them. Besides, the Scriptures defend only one kind of worship; the words adoration and invocation are used interchangeably in reference to the same object; invoking and adoring are applicable in a like

*Guericke: Christliche Symbolik, 243.

†For the most lucid elaboration of this matter to be found anywhere see Carpzov: Isagoge in libros symbolicos, 539.

sense; there is nowhere any divine authority to teach adoration of God and invocation of saints as an evidence that the higher reverence is accorded to the former. Says Hopkins in his exposition of the first commandment: "Withhold the worship from the saints and all other honors rendered them will speedily fall away." This succinct, but axiomatic truth settles the whole question of graduated steps in devotion between the creature and the Creator. But the design of keeping up these distinctions is to show that in worshiping the saints God is worshiped supremely and the saints inferiorly. This removes the objection of idolatry, it is thought. But the same process of reasoning would prove that the heathen who adored Jupiter as the one supreme—the father of all—yet invoked "lords many and gods many" of minor and inferior greatness, were not idolators. Yet the Bible expressly condemns as idolatrous all the ancient polytheisms which acknowledged a subordination in the sphere of deity and yet placed over all the minor and secondary divinities, one supreme God—the creator of all things.* It broadly and practically argues that such divinities are gods and to worship them was to render divine homage. Dr. Hodge† argues very conclusively that any homage, internal or external, which involves the ascription of divine attributes to its object, if that object be a creature, is idolatrous. And thus the homage paid by Catholics to the Virgin and the saintly host is a question of fact and not of theory. Pusey‡ relates that a friend of his was asked to offer a prayer to the Virgin Mary in exactly the same language which we address to the Holy Trinity. The reader of Roman Catholic literature will be astonished to find so many illustrations confirmatory of this. Yet Cardinal Newman§ insists that idolatry is: "regarding and worshiping a being as one and the supreme God, which *is* not; but any other worship is not idolatry even though we regard a saint as a secondary divinity 'all but' the one and supreme God." We can only ask the de-

*See this idea admirably discussed by Mozley: Theory of Development, 67.

†Systematic Theology, III, 281.

‡Eirenicon, 106.

§Development of Doctrine.

vout and learned defender of "Mary and all the saints," what then shall we make of the fact that there has been in all ages an idolatry which has not answered his definition, though Scripture, history, reason and common sense have all so designated it from the creation of the world? It is much easier to construct theories *from* the teachings of history than to fit the teachings of history *into* theories evolved from one's own consciousness.

And here the burden of the argument may rest. Let it be admitted that theoretical distinctions can be preserved in the canons of œcumenical councils and papal decrees; are they practical? Even if we were compelled to admit the reasons Romanists urge as sufficient to establish distinctions of worship, history shows that practically the passing from invocation to adoration is speedy and easy and hagiolatry soon becomes idolatry;* and the proof is abundant that countless Catholics in all circumstances of life apply much quicker to the Virgin and the saints than to the Father and the Son. And why not? It is so attractive to human nature. Besides, what worshiper can keep in mind the varieties of prayer demanded by the three-fold form of devotion? As soon as he approaches the object of his devotions intellectual distinctions must absolutely vanish. You may convey to the ear the separate idea of *latria*, *doulia* and *hyperdoulia* but you can not convey it to the heart of the worshiper. What answer would the devout Romanist of Italy or Spain or even France give to your question as to how he distributed his worship this morning between his patron saint, the Virgin Mary and the Deity? His very ignorance and simplicity would be the strongest argument against the hair-splitting discriminations in worship. At least the common people are unable to reconcile the *de fide* teachings of the church and the pious opinions obtained from popular instruction.†

Yet the saint-worshiper strenuously contends that the homage he pays to angels and the spirits of the departed is an indirect exaltation of God and promotion of the glory of Christ; these created beings are the reflection of divine majesty, the halo around the brow of Divinity and when he beholds them by faith

*Zöckler, 170. †Pusey: Eirenicon, 12.

he stands in awe before the Deity himself, in adoring the heavenly host he accords the ultimate thoughts of his devotion to Him alone. We may answer him after the sublime manner of Arnobius* in his masterly defence of Christianity against the heathenism of the third and fourth centuries: If you can not prove irrefutably that these saints (gods) are what you represent them to be, why do you ask us to worship them? we want to know whom we worship. If they are what you tell us of them why do you not prove it to us from the eternal principles of reason and common sense? And if that is true which you affirm of them, namely that they have sprung from the Supreme Being and are a part of him, why do you ask of us the idle task of approaching one or each of them personally, since it is His good pleasure that we should take hold of the divine himself? "The supreme Deity suffices us—the Creator and Lord of the universe, who orders and rules all things; in whom we serve all that requires our service; in him we worship all that should be adored, and venerate all that demands the homage of our reverence." Even long before (A. D. 110) Tatian† had said: "Man is to be honored as a fellow man; but God alone is to be reverenced." Here are the seeds of Athanasius' adamantine argument which assails the idea of inferior worship in the Church of Rome with as crushing a force as it did the Arians when he convicted them of idolatry in the worship of Christ as a creature: "Ye have two gods—the uncreated and a created—one begotten and the other unbegotten."

Finally, saint-worship is *dangerous* because it is destructive of *sound morality*. The logical sequence of the argumentation of our Confession points out this practical result. Not to say, that the practice it condemns, endangers our salvation—that is a foregone conclusion—but that it undermines and eventually destroys the principles called for by a pure code of morals. This is not a question of speculative theology or metaphysics, but of history, which must decide in how far the morality of a people suffers from the intermingling of the names of the departed in their devotions. Dr. Newman by *a priori* reasoning

*Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VI, 464. †Ibid, II, 66. *Contra Arian.*

seeks to prove that the carnal mind will not be led to the worship of God if the worship of saints is forbidden. But St. Paul* is against him. Admit co-ordinate divinities and the same consequences will follow in professedly Christian devotion which followed the forsaking of the Supreme Being in Gentile worship. Only the indwelling of God in the soul can arrest the downward tendency induced by original sin. The object of faith and veneration must be both almighty and immaculate. This is the dictum of universal experience and not the dictum of a system. And probably the least objectionable feature is that the invocation of the saints inspires and encourages the tendency toward a mere *sensuous worship*, which, if it does not belittle the faculties of the soul, does not quicken and ennoble them.

Gibbons† admits that a heart tenderly attached to the saints will give vent to its feelings in the language of hyperbole, just as an enthusiastic lover will call his future bride his adorable queen without any intention of worshiping her as a goddess. But can such a sentimentalism be acceptable to Christ? It borders on the offensive, and the learned Cardinal knows full well that even the worship of Mary has often nothing exalting in it. Some of the invocations addressed to her are shocking in their suggestiveness.‡ It seems almost irreverent to detract in any way from the honor of the mother of our Lord, but if she be conscious of some of the silly contemplations which have been written about her in the name of religion the spotless purity of her noble womanhood must revolt with indignation.

Saints usurp the place of Christ in the soul; they are so much easier of access, so much easier to conciliate, so much more tolerant of human weakness, so much more ready to make allowance for broken law. Thus not only are the elements of divine worship obliterated but the personal efforts at holiness neglected by those who expect their patron saints to accomplish for them the needed restoration. As in the days of Deborah§ "the highways are unoccupied, and the travelers walk through the byways." It is the demand of true Christianity to walk in the footsteps of Jesus, but there are not a few people of doubtful

*Rom. 1 : 23, 24. †Faith of our Fathers, 182.
‡Edgar's Variations of Popery, 547. §Judges 5 : 6.

morality who, rather than do this *one* duty, will undertake to do more than their duty. True, the devout Romanist will ask whether saint-worshipers are not better church-goers than their opponents; whether art has not received the impetus of its wonderful development from the opportunities offered to sculpture and painting by the cultus he defends; whether the rich variety in the history of the saints, as for instance the innocent sweetness of St. Agnes, the captivating beauty of a Magdalene, the holy earnestness of the dying Jerome, have not had a most potent influence upon the mind and heart of human society; whether the countless instances of ecclesiastical monuments erected in memory of a mother, a child, a brother, a friend have not dotted many lands with the grandest churches, chapels and monasteries? Would the worship of the saints then weaken devotion to the Saviour? Would the honors paid to the mother of Christ detract from the reverence due her Son? Protestants will admit the premise, but the conclusion does not follow. Suppose saint-worship does contain much that is beautiful and has given a powerful impulse to the plastic arts: the gods and goddesses of Greece were thought to be far more beautiful and found far more beautiful exemplification in art, nevertheless her religion was stamped from the beginning with the sure marks of mutability, corruption and decay.

Aside from the express teaching of God's word—by the admonition to worship God alone and by the prohibition not to divide allegiance—the question must be decided by the testimony of fact, not conjecture or presumption. We may assert in all charitableness to Catholic Christians that the ravages of unbelief and corrupt morality are greatest where adoration of the saints is made most prominent. One most notable phase was already remarkable in and prior to the days of the reformers. It was a vast channel for the enrichment of the Church. The popes turned the sale of the works of the saints, their bones and other relics into a most lucrative trade: Wickliffe had said: "Avarice lies at the root of the practice," and Luther with his idiomatic vigor replied: "The pope* has reaped an immense rev-

*De Missa: Mueller, 305.

enue from the traffic; when once no more aid can be gained from them, they will soon be allowed to rest." It is notorious to-day that Rome makes as good a merchandise out of the relics of Christian martyrs as do the Egyptians out of the mummies of heathen Pharaohs and Potiphars.* "If thou wilt help me to the realization of my ambition, I will canonize thee," said Pope Benedict XIV. to an object of his veneration.†

This is not an accidental or necessary outgrowth of the practice in a particular age or country. History, past and present, marshalls its evidence. In the Abysinian or Ethiopian Church where the worship of the saints was the most conspicuous element of Christianity, the immorality was notorious and shocking in the extreme.‡ Claus Harms§ in replying to the question whether the final abolition of this practice from the German churches had enhanced the moral status of the people unhesitatingly asserts that especially two virtues of the Christian faith, industry and chastity, had largely increased. Dr. Greenwald|| gives an alarming picture of the country where this fundamental element of Roman Catholicism has untrammeled sway. Dr. Pusey¶ says "it is notorious that this system is the great barrier to Christian union and the ground of alienation of pious minds in England." The piety of the Church of England can not affiliate with the state of morality in English Romanism! What a commentary on the lugubrious lamentations of Faber: "Here in England Mary is not half enough preached; *hence* it is *that Jesus is not loved,*** that heretics are not converted, that the Church is not exalted; that souls which might be saints, wither and dwindle. *Thousands of souls perish because Mary is withheld from them.*"†† And all this because of the sensitiveness of the nation in regard to the honor and glory of JESUS. What is the significance of a comparison between South America, Mexico, or even Spain and Italy, where the worship of the saints has unhindered play, with England and Germany and the United States, where it is checked by what Faber calls "the sneers of of heresy."

---

*Miracles and Saints, 93. †Hase: Polemik, 301. ‡Herzog: 1 : 48.
§Augs. Conf., 218. ||Luth. Ch. Rev., V, 11. ¶Eirenicon, 108.
**The italics are Faber's. ††Ibid, 115.

It has been intimated in high circles and on *ex cathedra* assurance that the definition of the *Cultus Sanctorum* was as necessary in the sixteenth century as was that of the *Homoousion* in the fourth; but this examination of Article XXI of the Augsburg Confession shows that there is no similarity between a *truth* which had from the first been believed by all except acknowledged heretics, and a *practice* which was not observed by the successors of the apostles, had no definite and uniform advocacy among the Church Fathers; was always arraigned by some of the most spiritual men of the Church; had persistent opponents at the Council of Constance, was assailed in the Ante-Tridentine theology, repudiated and condemned by many of the representative men of the Romish Communion; and, above all, is contrary to the word of God, derogatory to the glory of the Redeemer, repugnant to the spiritual worship of God, pervaded with the evils of polytheism and idolatry, and has no foundation in reason and morality.

Indeed the cardinal doctrine so bravely defended by the Confessors finds a vivid illustration in a saying prevalent among the country people of Suabia, that immediately before death each Catholic must become Protestant—*Evangelisch*; after extreme unction the priest discloses to the dying the need of an implicit trust in Jesus because all hope in the saints is a delusion. And this accords with the dying testimony of Augustine,* who suddenly broke forth in his last moments, as if a revelation had come to him from another world: "Now at last I have learned that the heavenly Father hears the prayers of his believing children." And that is the real "Communion of saints," when all believers in the Triune God join with the angels and the saints in worshiping him in spirit and truth, who rules in heaven and on earth—our Creator, Preserver and Redeemer.

---

**Apologia:* Mueller, 229.

## ARTICLE II.

### INFANT BAPTISM THE BASIS OF CHRISTIAN NURTURE.

By Rev. Lee M. Heilman, A. M., Chicago, Illinois.

The work of spiritual nurture must start with a first principle. Education and culture in every sphere begin with and elaborate a present embryo existence. The injunctions "to train" and "bring up" necessarily imply something as yet undeveloped but which is the specific subject of nurture. St. Paul enjoined on Timothy not to neglect even the ministerial gift he had just freshly received by the laying on of hands.

This idea of developing a germinal life seems to be far from prevalent in the present care of the young. There are eminent failures at training in the cases of thousands of the Church's children in our cities and larger towns. Explanations are offered in the hindrance arising from necessary toil and cares of the middling classes; every resource is drawn on to avert the evil impending over the pupils of our public and religious schools; genius has elaborated aids for teaching and makes the modern press groan under tons of juvenile literature, until the so-called Christian and Bible training stands side by side with the cause of missions as a feature of the century, and methods and study—evangelism, city missions and lay work are enlisted to supplement what seems to have been neglected or failed in, but these are very frequently attended by only a hollow echo and absence of genuine fruit. The science of religious education seems to advocate a struggle after varieties—ways and men and efforts not yet worn threadbare in "gospel hardening." But is there not a central germinal basis from which all operations must proceed? In the classic and casual literature on this subject, and therefore probably too in the pulpit and among various workers, there is seldom an allusion to the essential method of developing a primary principle. The truth is that the army of teachers particularly is left to a routine of mental instruction and a general beating of the air; and this is so because the divine

plan of training from childhood and infancy a certain primordial life is lost sight of through rational skepticism and so has fallen into disrepute and disuse. The Scriptures point to a definite training in a certain way of righteousness by nurture of a life which grows in the Lord.

But all are born with a principle of evil which no method of culture can transform into a holy principle. This innate vice if unchecked will naturally grow into proportions of a dominant character, and hence we are forced to the alternative of seeking for another, opposite force, which is the seed to be matured into the life desired.

This process of vital development is taught in the "law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus." Christianity is such a development. The Divine Kingdom is an organic life with consecutive relations of growth. The centre and source of this life is the incarnation of the Son of God in humanity, thence first in the individual soul and next in the body of believers—the Church, of which he is also the head. This union with Christ is the life to be nurtured, and must be implanted as the comprehensive seed containing fundamentally all that constitutes the mature life of the individual as a living member of the organic mystic body. To this germ or plant specifically all true methods of education closely adhere.

There is also a point of time and place at which this beginning is effected. The ordinance of baptism is a divinely appointed rite for admitting persons into the union of the Church —the body of Christ. During all the divine dispensations on earth there has been an ordinance for the young prior to their apprehension of its meaning—a sacrament before they could receive the means of the Word. The nurture proceeded from and with that beginning. There is not a hint in Scripture that training had any place where this starting-point was not first effected. There was some essential element there that was not to be omitted and in the future training not to be ignored.

We find then in the ordinance of baptism applied to the child an efficacy that would prophesy its value in that soul's future rearing.

In this ordinance are more than forms and symbols. The Scriptures promise with it *saving* benefits. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." Hence baptism is also connected with *forgiveness of sins*—"Repent and be baptized * * * for the remission of sins," and where that is there must also be the reconciled state of justification. But this saving and pardoning good includes then necessarily a certain form or degree of *regeneration*, and hence too the presence and operation of the Holy Ghost. This renewing power therefore we find declared in the words, "Born of water and of the Spirit," "According to his mercy he saves us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." So that with the proper use of the water connnected with the word is also the Spirit as the efficient divine agent to produce the blessed result of the renewal. St. Peter also promised the Spirit in the ordinance connected with the word or doctrine of Christ's name and his offer of pardon when he said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the *gift of the Holy Ghost.*" In this broad sense then baptism is called the "bath" or "laver of regeneration." Through this sacrament the union of Christ with the soul is effected ordinarily, and so union with the body of Christ, for "by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." Our Lord was himself baptized so that he might bring his people with and by himself into the covenant union. "For as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Hence to be "baptized into his death" is to become partakers of his death and thereby also of his resurrection and so ingrafted into his life.

And all these effects are promised to the smallest child. The old covenant which has never been and never will be annulled in its embracing infants has in its nature more than an external form. Circumcision whose complete office was exhibited in adults, was connected with spiritual circumcision or change of heart, and with the child therefore could exist essentially only under the same general conditions. The infant was meant to be in no less blessed relation to God and his Church than the

man. The promise in its fulness was and is to the children. Christ said that his kingdom of grace was composed of infants and those whose life and spirit had attained to their infant docility, trust and guileless sincerity. When he therefore blessed them it was not an unmeaning form or merely a solemn and symbolic act, signifying what then had no existence in fact and possibly through the temptations in the path to youth never would exist. The divine acts were not of an empty significance and much less the sacred ordinances which were to be administered to all nations and for all time—"until He come." A promise of favor in baptism is a guarantee of the offer of spiritual and inner blessing. The Scriptures declare that the ordained form is a "*seal*" as well as a "sign," but then there must be something to seal. It is a "pledge" of the present fulfilment of the visible sign, for the pledge is the promise of immediate acceptance into divine favor and is furthermore an initiation into a vital relation with the kingdom of God, which state is "sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise," necessarily and effectively there present. And the Spirit in his saving and regenerating presence has no office if it be not of the inward motion on the heart. The consequent spiritual grace is therefore offered, and being unresisted effects its end with the child. The possibility of such influences is put beyond question when it is learned how John the Baptist was endowed with the Holy Ghost from the womb; and the natural child Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost and preserved in the Spirit in his entire nature from the conception on, partly so as to show that infant-nature has capacity for such endowment, and also that through him other children might enjoy the divine possession. And though he himself from infancy was in the divine kingdom in immaculate purity, he was yet finally also baptized and so opened a new channel by baptism to bring children and others into the mystical union of that kingdom.

The presumption too of reason and our feelings is that the young nature just entering on a life of many snares would be put in possession of some power to be developed over against and instead of what otherwise would be produced by the natural power of evil. Where sin abounds grace doth much more

abound. A sacrament implants its life before the word can be apprehended, so that the root of the spiritual life beginning co-ordinately with the propensity to sin, may prevent sin while its dire results and the remedy against it in the word are not yet comprehended. So then the baptized child when it comes to the age of conscious accountability has a field first sown with wheat—a vantage ground over him who would sow all in tares. Grace thus in the Christian child abounds more than sin. One cannot well conceive that the loving Father, with his promise of a family covenant with his people, would leave the most helpless to beat against the storm without the essential and only safeguard. This is the only theory that is in harmony with the constant scripture provision for the children, and with the precious invitation of the eternal Son to have them come to him on the ground that they are of the heavenly kingdom and are privileged to enter where he both from infancy and by baptism before them entered. This lends special significance to the command, "Feed my lambs." They have a real spiritual nature akin to the sheep—believing adults. They are not goats to be converted into lambs.

These children, who through their relation to the Church by birth and by the initiative rite have always stood in a different relation to God from those outside of these conditions, are to be reared in a peculiar nurture.

In the fact therefore of such a spiritual child-life our own Scriptural Church is abundantly versed; and the standards of most of the other denominations are remarkably emphatic on the benefits of infant baptism. Dr. C. Hodge in his great work says on baptism, "What is to hinder the imputation to them [infants] of the righteousness of Christ, or receiving the renewing of the Holy Ghost so that their whole nature may be developed into a state of reconciliation with God? Doubtless this often occurs." Watson, too, the great Methodist theologian, says, "Baptism secures the Holy Ghost in those secret spiritual influences by which actual regeneration of those children who die in infancy, is effected, and which is the seed of life in those who are spared."

If baptism has no spiritual benefit for the infant, then all Pro-

testantism must change its definitions of a sacrament or else renounce infant baptism. Even the most pronounced low-churchmen of our communion who have given study and their pen to the subject have had to surprise themselves and others with some such conclusions.

It may seem however that the benefits of infant baptism are not of a sufficiently tangible nature to admit of recognition in education. It would be sufficient reply to say that the promises of grace are such as to demand of our faith and prayers the expectation of at least some divine result in the advancing years, but there is more than speculative efficacy in baptismal grace. Where the renewal of the Holy Ghost is, there are also the *elements* of the new life. The Spirit received here, as always, bears fruits of quickening and illumination. Hence susceptibilities are there which make the earliest dawn of reason more open to hear and assent to the truth. The spiritual nature is awakened to those tender degrees of pliability that make the slightest touches of good influence felt ere even speech is understood. Herein therefore lie the definite and more complete tangible factors of a regenerate nature, namely, repentance and faith. Faith, the indispensable element in any truly gracious effects, is here necessarily present. The sacrament in itself is a "seal of the righteousness of faith," and similar to the Lord's Supper is a "sacrament of repentance and faith." One of the blessed fruits of the Spirit therein is declared to be "faith."

Faith in its profoundest sense does not consist in knowledge, for even groanings by the spirit which cannot be uttered and hence also cannot be understood distinctly, even in adults make effectual intercession with God. There are unfathomable longings of nature that are acceptable at the throne. Hence are not the tender leanings of a child upon the arm and upon the guiding of a parent really faith? The earliest promptings to look up to, to obey and to put confidence in a mother are trust—not the trust of broad intelligence, but the best the child is capable of—the offering "according to that he hath," which is the measure of the divine requirement, and this is a tangible effect. And may it not be that this trust of the baptized child implies the influences that come within the range of the sacred promises,

and is not merely a natural motion? The sacramental virtue begins co-ordinately with the power to sin and so may early pervade the young nature and character. Timothy's faith mentioned as connected with that of his mother and grandmother, must have begun in the earliest susceptibilities, from the time the mother's own faith influenced the child and ere it was guided by its independent knowledge. But he also grew up in this faith for it is expressly recorded that he would be "nourished up in the words of faith whereunto he had attained"—that is, would be additionally nourished in what he had already received while yet in his mother's arms. His original faith would so be perpetuated into the tree and fruits of even his ministerial piety and other general qualifications. Similarly the wide-spreading life of faith and holiness in Samuel from the circumcision at the temple, of John the Baptist from the mother's womb, and even of the blessed Lord himself—it all had *grown in* the divine favor; and so since their mature life was a growth it follows that the faith and its accompaniments all existed in the germ principle from which this later and elaborate faith and life were developed. Hence too the earliest and controlling motives in them were gracious and not natural. The Spirit produces a fruit of faith which has all the concomitant affections of "gentleness," "temperate" restraints and "goodness" in deeds. We therefore have reason to believe that a boy is disposed to be obedient, truthful and to grow up in a proper Christian life because the baptismal blessing sanctifies his thoughts and desires. These gracious results began moreover, in the earlier ground-work—the rudiments of faith and repentance.

The requirement to apprehend and *know* of the truth and of the ordinance, before faith and its life can be said to exist, is to bring faith to the lower realms of reason where it does not belong. It is precisely what gnosticism demanded—to *know* consciously. Roman Catholicism too requires that some one have faith in the *sacraments themselves* and hence has to *know* of them; and so the efficacy of baptism depends on the conscious *intention* of the administering priest. Faith is above such carnal mixture of rationalism. Therefore Jesus speaks so distinctly of

the faith the "little ones" have and have in him—"who believe on me."

There is here then abundant of that which is tangible and may be trained. This faith and its associated tenderness of penitence are the very substance of the Christian life—the elements which are to be deepened in the youthful character. The fact that baptism is administered but once and has thenceforth a constant virtue, argues that there is more than simply the Spirit's presence, there is a product of the Spirit—an implanted life. The office indeed of the Spirit is to impart Christ, for in baptism Christ "is put on"—who is the life of faith and holiness—"the righteousness and sanctification." Here is the vital departure of Romanism which holds that baptism *ex opere operato*—through the administration of the ordinance as an objective reality produces the saving effects: Protestantism says that it is the word and Spirit which impart Christ in a vital union. Faith does not effect this as a conscious factor—a faith in which itself one must in turn have faith, but the blessing lies in the union with Christ and *effects* faith which is the gift of God—a gift bestowed through the ordained means. Faith in itself is not a means—it is a product, but always an essential adjunct of every gracious work—an element of the effect. This gift of Christ himself in the union of faith is an implanted objective fact then not a magic effect, and not merely an attendant influence of the Spirit, but a work of the Spirit, and constantly sustained by it. This means then that here is a substantial reality—a life that may be taken hold of and developed into mature character.

Since then such effects are produced, is their peculiar divine power to be wasted? Even the slightest susceptibilities would hardly be bestowed of God without intentional permanence and for constant future good. The Scriptures indicate emphatically that the effects of the infant rite are to continue. The ancient prophets and leaders made their ringing appeals to the people on the basis of the people having received the sacrament of circumcision, and the Jews habitually boasted of their being "of the circumcision" as against the uncircumcised Gentiles. Jeremiah recalled to their minds this rite to stir them to improve what was signified in the early sign and seal, urging them, "Cir-

cumcise yourselves to the Lord and take away the foreskin of your heart." Accordingly also St. Paul with a view to encouragement to hope in the promises reminds the Galatians how by their baptism into Christ they had put on Christ. The seed of life is planted early in the child's nature so that it might grow continuously and consecutively into the stalk and fruit over against the otherwise constant growth of innate sin. And when once the young are grown to adult members, they through the early influences and effects of their baptism continuing daily, become a purified and purifying Church, for it is declared that "Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it that he might *sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.*" That word is not only connected with the water at the administration of the rite, but its meaning and promises are also recalled during the child's development, and so this "visible word" as this sacrament is termed, becomes a life-long means of grace—in far off years purifying and cleansing the Church.

The Romish Church, apprehending the true design of a sacrament, saw the necessity of one for those fallen from the virtue of baptism, and accordingly invented that of penance; and some before that time delayed baptism until near death to avoid falling from the pardon of sins which it offered; but these are misapprehensions concerning the permanent virtue of this ordinance. This is not repeated as the other means of grace are, because it provides a germ which contains the life-force of the entire Christian tree. This divinely implanted seed is meant to effect nothing less than the truest perfection of the soul and hence plays a vital part in that soul's after training.

Since then we have such a starting point of Christian life and development in the young of the Church we must measure the extent and meaning of the trust committed to us.

It certainly claims endeavors and means that will effect its enlargement. It is in the child as yet not a perfect life of faith. It has in the beginning but germinal potencies, which are waiting to be perfected as soon as the conscious personal side of the subject enters with its knowledge. This state where the implanting is but once, if left uncultivated, may lie dormant for years just as a seed does, but it is not character in this neglected

form and hence at the period of responsibility is not of saving benefit, for then the Lord wants matured tree and fruit. There is thus peril in carelessly possessing such a grace. This mighty virtue in potential forms is administered once and only once—it is not of the nature of nourishment, to be repeated as the word and eucharist need be, but it is wholly imbedded at the first planting and hence the future character and welfare are dependent upon developing it. A trust of so substantial a possibility has a claim on the Church to whose bosom it is committed—it is a heavenly talent which dare not be wrapped up in a napkin. Here is a living force which promises to spread through the entire spirit and career of the child's future, and in the spiritual rearing of that child this force cannot be overlooked. Since also by the union with Jesus that soul is in the Church and a living member of that mystical organism, it is to be developed in and with the growth of all the parts and is designed to enter intimately into the one pervading life of the comprehensive body. If then it cease to grow into the full stature it mars the structure and becomes disease in it. It has vital union and must not be unnourished or bruised. The baptized infant is brought into the organic life for protection just as the body sustains its members. To this nurture consequently home and church, parent and ministry have a mutual relation. The parent is the instrument to whom the first longings of faith cling and where all the original Christian motions find activity, and that parent is placed in the position to support this tendril. He is the agent of the covenant in the beginning, through his own faith, and for a time is the priest through whom the word and the daily renewal of the seal of baptism is administered to the developing child. But besides the parent, the Church through the parents' union with it and through the officiating ministry as also agent to the covenant arrangement, is bound by the same solemn ties to provide for this growth and especially in due time to provide the word and the bread of the Holy Supper. These relations in themselves argue that the spiritual life at first so imperfect and yet so infinitely promising, justly claims from them endeavors of training,—indeed it is for this, these offices and relations

of family and church exist. The sacred trust committed to Christians and to the Church is a talent which is faithfully kept only when reared in the nurture for which it is so early given.

And further it is to be remarked that this gift in infant baptism is the only object capable of Christian nurture. No more than the substance and fundamental elements of Christian life given in that ordinance can be expected. What substitute is there for these heavenly mysteries, or what other basis in a child is there to be touched, on which to construct a Christian character? The aesthetic nature or the ultilitarian faculties may be cultivated, but neither can produce the spiritual life demanded in the divine kingdom. Philosophy admits the fact of the spiritual nature in man but that nature is fallen and cannot evolve holy character. Such a result must begin with the centre of such development—that is, the incarnate Son of God in union with the soul. Training means the rearing of a particular plant or life towards maturity, and so we have one definite grace of the child furnished for spiritual growth. The Christian home and school and church have not a secular, mental or social faculty to educate first and by and by the religious. There is but one true life and to that all else must be subsidiary and nothing co-ordinate with it. The two spheres trained separately jar and end in confusion and doubt, and it is impossible that the earliest secular culture will find the youth in a more mature period naturally turning to spiritual concerns. That "natural" tendency is the contrary of this, and, if educated alone, overrides the spiritual life.

There is left then but the single alternative of submitting the child to the sign and seal of the covenant of promise so that it may be reared in the grace divinely offered. There is but one door, and that is Christ, and he is there by the Spirit in the ordinance—the incarnate Saviour, the beginning and source of all true life. Outside of this the child is without the means of the union with Christ. Who can expect to bring it to the earliest development of a full regenerate character—bearing the fruits of the Spirit, when the appointed medium of the Spirit is neglected or refused? From the beginning of the Church the covenant with the children was sealed with a sacrament before the means

of the word was possible. When the young fall away from holy living, legitimate efforts to reclaim them are made more hopeful and aided by the prevenient susceptibilities of faith and repentance as substantially imparted in baptism, for the backsliders are still in the covenant and under its obligations and its promises.

From these two propositions, then, that baptismal grace claims endeavors in the way of training and that this is the only object capable of training, we infer how derelict in the genuine work of saving the young of the Church is the effort that aims principally at conversion. It keeps digging up the soil and essays to plant the seed which it still but disturbs, while that same effort ought to be nurturing the gracious life already present. It sets aside all the early covenant and spiritual relations as unnecessary or unreal. These growing hearts that are supposed to be taught and reared in the covenant sympathies and influences of pious homes and the sanctuary, are thus rather to be regarded as outside the divine promises and practically heathen. They cannot take comfort from the promise that they are saved since being baptized they also now believe. They must rather doubt that they are children of God until they have found evidences of regeneration in the domain of self-conscious reason. This ignoring the virtue of grace in the sacrament is a subversion of the entire scheme of means in redemption, and tends so to discard even the divine word. The legitimate fruit of this course has been in the wild song and shout and confusion of prayer as substitutes for the instruction of the holy word. Professing to be guided by reason rather than by "forms and symbols" men have contradicted themselves even here and have dispensed with that reason which they profess to exalt; and so by seeking conversion in the feelings without means and often in an immediate gift and witness of the Spirit, as they imagine, they accept a belief in results without means unless it be the means of evolving spiritual life by the magic of extraordinary human effort, all which is much more difficult to believe than that God will own his appointments; and their course practically rejects both intelligent reason and the divine ordinances. Where then is the consistency in observing any of the sacraments, and especially

infant baptism if so be that its effects are not to be cherished and extended? But that is not all. When the beautiful faith of a child is set back as not the faith of conversion, it is dissuaded from enjoying the love of Christ which it has, and thus gets a distrust, which tends ever after to produce doubt in its divine acceptance. The heart is wounded by being crushed away from the consolation of the promises, and unhealed wanders in the dark and fatal forests of fear. The tender plant of faith and hope and love is retarded in the growth and for years may not be able to recover the loss, if ever here it can. Woe is pronounced against those who offend the little ones that believe on Jesus.

There is supreme wisdom in concentrating the continued efforts and agencies of a life-time upon the development of this one talent of the Spirit. Character building is not the work of a spasmodic effort. It is an objective growth. This one original principle faithfully nurtured effects commonly the only secure and permanent assurance and is well nigh certain of final perseverance, for the child "trained up in the way he should go when he is old will not depart from it." The convert of a day is not to be discouraged but he has not the basis and foundation such as is steadily grown in years, his way is thorny with old habits developed from the natural evil. Many of the efforts thus which should be expended on establishing the faith are exhausted in trying to effect justification and conversion—planting but not cultivating fruit. Evangelists and revivalists are not apt at training, but notably leave the field as soon as the soil seems seeded. The Church's strength is in training,—in bringing up the young in their early most holy faith—the only principle capable of Christian nurture.

But now we are not left in ignorance of the way this life-principle is to be nurtured. The conduct of the nurture is suggested by the nature of the principle. The doctrine of "training" and "bringing up" implies that the Christian youth are to be led and guided in the gracious sphere in which they begin. The identical elements of the original baptismal life are to be wrought into stronger parts. The trust which a child has in a mother when not disappointed, deceived or discouraged even by a look, by

temper or tone of voice is trained into abiding confidence. So repentance for disobedience and confession of wrong are also taught until in the course of time the ideas of government, obedience, trust and love, rise into their grander significance before God the heavenly parent and his divine government, in which the child is indeed unwittingly being trained. The Holy Spirit in all these experiences is thus deepening his work. The restraints and chastisements as well as the daily teaching of patience are the administrations of the parental priesthood, by which process the child is increased in grace as by a sacrament —indeed this training is a constantly new application of the baptism in whose covenant the parent has agreed to bring up the infant subject in renouncing sin and growing in the works of grace and of the Spirit, and as the Spirit enlarges the mind the vows of the covenant are held up before the child, and by that sign the young heart is taught the filth of the flesh, the cleansing purity of Christ, and how it should die in its sinful nature and live in Christ. Thus the child is comforted and its hope brightened; and should a relapse occur that sign is meant like the rainbow after the deluge, to encourage the wandering soul to hope on and trust still in the unchanging promise. This recalling to remembrance the sacrament of infancy, like the ever recurring commemoration of the Lord's Passion, in the eucharist, renews and reinvigorates the original baptismal grace. The virtue of this first sacrament is so perpetuated as never to leave any, not even the child, without the means [benefits?] of a sacrament. At every turn therefore in the experiences and culture of the youth this remembrance with prayer for, and faith in behalf of, this first rite constitutes a substantial duty. The youth must learn to cherish the vows of his infancy as his own vows, and so piously expects from them perennial blessings, as the saintly Arndt and Spener and others were accustomed to pray God to bless their baptism and to help them keep the engagement. How much more then in the instructions from the divine word should not these vows be kept prominently in view. Law for the Christian is a rule of living and specially needful for the inexperienced. Catechisation and Bible teaching are therefore primarily and most fitly designed to inform the young Christian

in a knowledge of the divine will towards him and to lead him to fulfill his duty to the Lord. And as the life begun within has in germ the complete Christian stature, conscientiousness in daily living, the proper direction of the necessary faculty of amusement and all the duties and activities demanded in the Lord's vineyard, are here enforced and put to exercise. This is "edification"—building up the young believer in his already holy calling.

But further than this, through the union of that life with the body of Christ, and thence particularly with the Christian home, it appears that the most sacred alliances of affection and company and various daily influences, necessarily have part in shaping the feelings and thoughts of the child. The earliest grace, just as the innate evil, is developed through the eye and other experiences with voice, temper and conduct as a sign-language, an administered word. Every association of a Christian nature enhances this life of faith as pure air does tree and flower. On the other hand the touch of evil society harms the tender branch in its symmetry and future fruitfulness. Particularly harmful must be then the school where secular advances and temporal successes are set forth as the noblest end of life, and that too by unbelieving or erratic teachers who exert their peculiar influence of example and opinion upon the children at their most pliable age. In these organic relations there is the greater value therefore of pious example and of prayer on the part of parents and other Christians, as a perpetual means of training this sentitive life. The faith of Lois in these mutual vital channels was likewise breathed and transferred into the grandson Timothy through an intervening generation even, and still leaping vigorously in his spiritual veins. And what profound significance and power there is in teaching and preaching the divine word still quick and powerful with inspiration, where hearts are so divinely made susceptible. To teach Christian children by example and by precept is to be angel messengers to these heirs of salvation.

# ARTICLE III.

## HAVE WE THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURE?

Translated from the German of Prof. Mühlan, D. D., by the REV. B. PICK, PH. D., Allegheny, Pa.

### INTRODUCTION BY THE TRANSLATOR.

During the month of February, 1884, the professors W. Volck and F. Mühlan* in Dorpat delivered two lectures in the university hall. The former had for his theme: "How far are we to attribute freedom of error to the Bible?"† "The address," says Prof. Curtiss,‡ "is significant as coming from a pupil of Professor Delitzsch and from one who has the reputation in Germany of being very conservative. Instead of affirming that the Bible is a revelation from God, he maintains that it is a document of that revelation. He objects to the definition that "it is that book, which in a clear and sufficient manner, teaches what we must believe to gain eternal life," since "it contains much more, and almost three-fourths of the Bible could be dispensed with if this definition were correct." He holds that the effort to prove the errorless character of the Bible in matters of science and chronology is to divert our attention from it as a foundation, and to put us on our guard lest it be drawn away from under our feet. On the other hand, he affirms that to doubt the historical character of Abraham is to smite the head from the history of redemption, and protests against the assumption that the peculiar religious character of the people of Israel was not stamped upon them on Mount Sinai, but was the result of a gradual development."

To remove possible offenses, which his colleague might have given, Prof. Mühlan delivered the address which is here given

---

*Both are known as the editors of Gesenius' *Hebr. und Chald. Handwörterbuch*, Leipsic, 1878.

†"*In wie weit ist der Bibel Irrthumslosigkeit zuzuschreiben?*" Dorpat, 1884.

‡*Current Discussions in Theology*, Vol. III, p. 37 seq. Chicago, 1885.

in English. Both lectures made nevertheless a great stir in many circles, especially in those of the ministers, and pastor N. von Nolck in Oesel published a rejoinder entitled *Zur Inspirations frage** in which he not only accuses the lecturers but the entire faculty of having apostatized from the faith. The theological value of the rejoinder is, according to a German critic, little; but its importance was enhanced, inasmuch as it announced itself to be the "confession" of the Oesel synod. Lively controversies in papers and pamphlets followed. To put a stop, the professor emeritus Theodor Harnack published *Ueber den Kanon und die Inspiration der heiligen Schrift. Ein Wort zum Frieden*,† in which he takes issue with those who make the Scripture instead of Christ, the ground and corner-stone of faith and revelation. Whatever one may think of the lectures of Volck and Mühlan, there was no just reason for publicly accusing them, or the entire faculty, of a "manifest apostasy from the belief in the Holy Scriptures." In a chivalrous manner Harnack declares himself to be one and all with the faculty.

These introductory remarks will explain why we have ventured to give Mühlan's lecture in English.

Have we the original text of the Holy Scripture? What a question! Shall *this* not even be certain, that we have the pure text of the Bible word?—Thus sadly, or at least full of amazement the laymen ask.

And on the other hand I hear the man of science, above all the philologist, say: Have we the original text? Why this question? For the question here cannot be *whether* the received form of the text of the Old and New Testaments deviates from the original—this must be asserted from the very start—but, to what degree this is the case. For in truth, how should we have received the text of a book literally faithful, which contains portions, older perhaps than two thousand years, and whose most recent writings were composed nearly eighteen centuries ago? of a book which was circulated through many centuries, in some parts through thousands of years, and this by means of multiplying the manuscripts?

---

*Riga, 1885. †Dorpat, 1885.

But will the layman say, who lived in the firm belief to possess in his Bible the only, pure source of truth: The Scripture is not such a book like other books; and how could this book of books be for me the infallible word of God, when what I read to day in my printed Bible can no more be regarded with certainty as that which the prophets and the apostles have written down?

Correct as this objection appears to be to the simple, faithful mind, equally decided must I protest in the interest of our evangelical faith, against such a conception. For it presupposes an opinion of the Scripture as the word of God, which is contrary to the living Protestant conception and binds us to the word of Scripture in a legally external manner.

You have recently heard in this place from the mouth of my colleague* who defended the thesis, which every evangelical theologian must fully and entirely subscribe, that the Scripture is not directly *the* revelation, but only a *witness* of the revelation. My object to day is, by answering my thesis, to give you the historical proof of it, that only the latter conception of Holy Writ can be true. In doing this, I undertake to treat questions before you, which on account of their complicated nature and on account of the many details, which must be considered, are usually discussed only among professional men; but the importance of these questions is so great, the interest connected with answering the same, as a matter of course, touches us all so deep, that I will nevertheless undertake to initiate you into these literary minutiae.

Let us commence with the *Old* Testament. Its original language, as is known, is the Hebrew, only in some portions of the books of Daniel and Ezra, the Aramaic. In the case of the Old Testament it seems to be at the first glance, that our present text presents the most speaking evidence, that the hand of divine providence has kept it from the general fate of the literature handed down in manuscript. For not only do the printed edi-

*[Referring to the lecture of Prof. Volck: "In wie weit ist der Bibel Irrthumslosigkeit zuzuschreiben?" (*i. e.* in how far can infallibility be ascribed to the Bible?).—Tr.]

tions of the Hebrew text, but also all manuscripts, agree with each other, saving some unimportant matters. What this means will be clear when I indicate with a few words what our manuscripts and editions of the Hebrew Old Testament contain. The text proper is, as is the case with all Semitic languages (the Ethiopic excepted), a consonant text. But to the consonants are added partly below, partly above, partly within the same, a number of points, strokes and other small signs. Some of them serve to regulate the pronunciation of the consonants, others express the vowels with which the consonants are to be pronounced (the "vowel-points"), and others finally (the so-called "accents") serve as logical signs of division (somewhat like our signs of interpunctuation) or as musical signs to regulate the cantilating lecture in the synagogue. Added to this are marginal notes, which refer to the consonants, vowel-points and accents of the text, and at the end of the books the detailed statements of the number of chapters and verses, yea, even of the words and letters of each book. These marginal notes also indicate *e. g.* with great minuteness the consonants which differ from the common form of the text, which are to be written larger or smaller than the others, or are to stand above the line and the like. These additions to the text are called the "massora," *i. e.* tradition, and our Hebrew text of the Old Testament is therefore called the "massoretic."

As has already been stated, our present editions agree with oldest editions of the fifteenth century, as well as with the oldest manuscripts extant (of the XI. and XII. cent.), in all these particulars, saving the marginal notes and those at the end, which are wanting here and there, or are not complete.

We may well perceive how pious uncriticism would be led to recognize in this fact a clear proof of the inspiration of the Old Testament including even the smallest shades, and how, when in the seventeenth century loud voices were heard against such a conception, an embittered controversy was opened concerning the question whether the vowel-points and accents were original parts of the text and whether they are inspired or not.

Aside from other considerations, the very fact that the official manuscripts of the Old Testament which were used in the syna-

gogue service and which could only contain the rare text, should have been sufficient to restrain from the former assumption. Already Luther had the correct knowledge; he calls the additions to the consonant text "a new invention of men," from which one may deviate, whenever the sense requires it.

Far be it from me to underrate the value of the traditional punctuation of the Hebrew text. On the contrary, it is a commentary on the Old Testament, which must be regarded as one of the greatest exegetical efforts of all times; a commentary—supposed that our consonant text to be correct—which we can follow in most cases. And yet it is only a commentary, which, as we now know, is very recent when we consider the antiquity of the text, upon which it comments. The punctuation was not commenced before the sixth century of our era, and was completed in the eighth.

The Talmud, which was completed in the fifth century, knows not yet the vowel points and accents; and Jerome declares expressly, that the Hebrew manuscripts contain nothing but the consonant-text. But—and this is of the greatest importance for our text—the Talmud offers no other text than the one which we still have. It knows not even various readings, it rather traces back in many instances the reading to the oldest tradition. Yea, more than this; the Talmud already understands the consonant text of the Old Testament in the same manner, as it was afterwards fixed by vowels and accents.

Still further back we find the same text. Jerome who translated the Holy Scriptures into Latin about the year 400, a translation, which under the name of the Vulgate by a decree of the Council of Trent as the "authentic edition" was made co-equal with the original text of the Bible by the Church of Rome, and Origen in the first half of the third century, and so likewise the Aramaic translations of the Old Testament which originated in Babylon—all evidently appear to have already perused our consonant text.

Whence this remarkable agreement? How is this stability in the tradition to be explained, which has not the like in the history of those literary circles, which are nearer to us? Should this really be regarded as a proof, that our text does not essen-

tially differ from the original form ? For such an assumption the generally conceded fact seems also to speak that the transmitted text is of an undoubtedly high value. This is already evident to the student because of the numerous differences in the pronunciation and mode of expression which must necessarily be expected on account of the periods lying far apart, within which the single parts of the Old Testament were composed. Dialectic peculiarities and many other characteristics in form and grammar are here evidently faithfully preserved. Thus we see that not an unforming hand has effaced the differences of time and place or the individuality of the authors.

The answer to that often repeated question I will give further on. Let us, however, go still farther back, to the age of Jesus and the apostles, to the century, in which the books of the New Testament originated.

It is a fact, which by some observation, can also not escape the attention of the layman, that only the fewest of the Old Testament citations in the New Testament fully agree with the wording of the Old Testament. This of course in many instances explains itself from the fact, that the authors of the New Testament writings quoted from memory, or—what can be proved in many instances—that they intentionally changed the wording of the Old Testament. In most cases, however, it is evident, that they had the Hebrew text of the Old Testament neither before their eyes nor in their memory, but the text of that Greek translation of the Old Testament, which, as is evident from Philo and Josephus, was used by all Greek speaking Jews of that time beside or as a rule in place of the Hebrew Old Testament. I mean that translation, which in the main belongs to the third century before Christ and which was made by learned Alexandrian Jews. An old tradition makes it to be the work of seventy-two translators—a most significant number: it alludes to six translators from each of the twelve tribes of Israel ;—afterwards the number seventy has been given as a round number. This Greek translation is generally called the Septuagint, *i. e.* the work of the seventy. It is an invaluable, yea the most important testimony for the history of the Old Testament text in the pre-Christian time.

True we have it only in a much corrupt text; true that those learned Alexandrians translated the Hebrew text very often in a free manner, often also wrong on account of a deficient knowledge of the language and matter, yea they were not even afraid to make arbitrary additions here and there,—but in spite of all that, it may be perceived with full certainty, that the text, which was before them, in many passages materially differed from our received text.

Thus for instance we see that the book of Jeremiah, in the Hebrew text of the Septuagint had not only another order of its constituent parts, but also that the single addresses and historical sections were much shorter. There the book had only about seven-eighths of the size of our Hebrew Jeremiah. There evidently existed an entirely different recension of this prophetical book. Similar is the case with the book of Proverbs. Here a number of proverbs are wanting, which are found in our Hebrew text, while on the other hand a number of proverbs are wanting in our Hebrew text, which are found in the Septuagint. In both these cases the matter concerns different recensions or redactions of the books in question. Elsewhere, for instance in the book of Samuel (the first and second book of Kings in the Septuagint), numerous differences refer to single words of the text. Finally it can be proved or at least be made highly probable from the text of the Septuagint, that our Hebrew Old Testament shows gaps, which can be filled from the Septuagint. Thus in placing the Judaic cities enumerated in the 15th chapter of the book of Joshua upon a map, according to our Old Testament text, a region south of Jerusalem, round about Bethlehem (this included), remains vacant. This gap can be supplemented from the translation of the Septuagint, as the text which they perused was uninterrupted. Similar supplements may perhaps be made from the Greek text of the book of Kings.

Whatever one may think of the value of the Alexandrian recension, certain it is that it offers the actual evidence that there existed Hebrew manuscripts in the pre-Christian time, which had a text essentially different from ours; a text, which in many respects, be it only in a few cases, is to be preferred to ours.

We can even go a step farther and say, that the received text

is a proof, that in older times there existed different recensions, that soon after the composition of single books different texts formed themselves, yea, that the authors of our Old Testament books, the sources which they perused, already perused in different recensions. Or in what other way should we explain the fact, that none of the many duplicates in the Old Testament as far as the words are concerned, do not agree with each other? Thus we read that beautiful song of David, Ps. 18, in the second book of Samuel (ch. 22) in an essentially different recension. The same may be said of the duplicates in the book of Proverbs, of the genealogical lists in the Pentateuch and Chronicles, and of other parts. They are all a speaking proof, that the original text was changed in the course of time, and this in part to some extent.

And how could it be otherwise? We must not forget the fate which the books composed by the holy singers, prophets, historians of Israel, had necessarily to experience. Let us also suppose, that many an original copy has been preserved through some centuries. This is not so improbable, since most of them were written on skins, more seldom on linen. But it is hardly to be conceived that the copies which were made from most autographs at a very early time, were controlled by the latter. And how often may some books have been copied, especially such which above all were for the private use, as, *e. g.* the book of Proverbs. How often may copies have been made from poor copies. Or should there only have been faithful copies? Have we a right to judge the literature of Israel by another standard than we do with the other literature of the world, which has been propagated by manuscripts?

Yes, *here* errors were nearer at hand than in the case of the Græco-Roman literature. The Semitic writing, as has already been remarked, from the very beginning only designated the consonants. Besides, the words were not, as is already the case in the oldest inscriptions, separated from each other by paragraphs or points. A book roll written in the ancient Hebrew presented itself as an undisturbed continuous series of consonants from beginning to end; a fact, which must be regarded as the source of numerous mistakes. For even those readers and

copyists, who understood the language, must have had their doubts here and there, how to divide the letters into words, and with which vowels the consonants should be pronounced. This, however, gave rise to numberless errors in reading, and mistakes in copying.

In ancient times the characters, in which they wrote in Israel, were totally different from those of our manuscripts and printed editions. We now know very well the ancient Israelitish writing. A few year ago an inscription was found in a canal, which connects the spring of St. Mary of Jerusalem with the pool of Siloah. It probably belongs to the time of Hezekiah. The large inscription on the monument of King Mesha of Moab from the beginning of the ninth century, consisting of 34 lines, shows in the main the same characters.* This writing was certainly used in Israel till the time of the exile. On the Aramaic soil there was another Semitic writing, preserved to us in numerous seals, coins, papyri and inscriptions, and which may be traced back to the 8th century before Christ. It is mentioned Ezra 4 : 7, where we read that the enemies of the Jews in Jerusalem wrote a letter to King Artaxerxes, written in the Syrian tongue. Through the influence of this Aramaic writing, at the time when the Jews exchanged the Hebrew of their fathers for the Aramaic colloquial language, the old Hebrew writing was by degrees entirely transformed, till at last an entirely new writing originated, which, to distinguish it from the irregular marks of the older, was very regularly formed, so that each letter can exactly be put in a square, whence this writing was also called the square-writing. In it not a few inscriptions of Palestine are written, which in part are older than our era. In this writing it is true the yod is the smallest letter of the alphabet, in it the letters are adorned with small spire-like ornaments, called in Greek "tittles," and this will explain the saying of the Lord (Matt. 5 : 18): "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law."

---

*[Reference is made to the *Moabite Stone*. A fac-simile of the inscription together with an English translation is found in McClintock and Strong's *Cyclop.* s. v. *Mesha*. For a complete history and literature comp. Ginsburg *The Moabite Stone*, 2d ed., London, 1871.—Tr.]

During the period, comprising many centuries, in which the gradual change of the writing was effected for this very reason, many a mistake has crept into the received text. Ere the fluctuating, irregular characters gave way to the later and regular ones, the writing itself offered more occasion for changing the letters to the scribes than was the case, in spite of many similar letters, with the square writing which from the time of Jesus to our days has experienced hardly any change.

In fine there is yet a last, and very important point, which must be mentioned. Let us not forget: the Israelites before the exile regarded most of the books, which we now hold as holy writings, as very precious, but not yet as holy before others. Many a writing, which we have no more, was regarded equally as precious as those, which have been preserved. From the book of Chronicles we learn that Isaiah wrote a history of King Uzziah; other prophetical and historical books are there also mentioned, which certainly were regarded no less than many prophetical and historical books, which are now parts of our Old Testament. But of the anxious care of later periods, to preserve the received letter, faithfully, there is certainly not the least indication. It was only in the time of Ezra, the "scribe," when the learned occupation, at first with the law, commenced, when by degrees they commenced to distinguish what should be regarded as holy or not of the received literature, only then they commenced to fulfill in an external manner of the word, what the apostle Paul (Rom. 3 : 3) designates as the prerogative of Israel, to preserve "what has been intrusted to them, the oracles of God." From this time on, value was attached to the received letter of the Scripture, now the question was raised, and by degrees it was solved through a work of many centuries, what should be regarded as the genuine text of Moses and the prophets. At this time passages like Deut. 4 : 2 ("Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you") were interpreted with regard to the external keeping of the received letter of the text, instead of taking them as the rule of a living, inward obedience. In this sense Josephus asserts in his apology con-

cerning the antiquity of the Jewish people against Apion, the learned heathen of Alexandria, that the Jews distinguish themselves before all nations of the world in that they have 22 divinely credited writings, to whose text none would dare to add or to take away anything from it.

When Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans (70 A. D.), the Jews formed for themselves a new center at Jamnia, situated a few miles west from Jerusalem, not far from the sea. Here resided, after the high priesthood had ceased with the cessation of the temple-worship, the nasi or patriarch, who was now regarded as the spiritual head of the Jews. He was also the president of the spiritual academy, where the study of Scripture was cultivated, and where on the basis of an anxiously literal interpretation of the law of the fathers all important questions of sacred jurisprudence, which rose everywhere among the Jews, were decided. Later, the seat of the nasi was transferred to Tiberias on the lake of Genezareth, and the heathenish city founded by Herod Antipas, on whose unhallowed soil once no Jew would have lived, now became the much-admired and frequented center of the Jews. Here at any rate the last hand was laid on the redaction of the Old Testament text. The authority of this spiritual central jurisdiction of Israel explains it, that this text was everywhere received. It is the same text, which the Talmud already looked upon as impalpable; it is the same which we have now.

And because since the fourth and fifth centuries after Christ, we have everywhere only one and the same text—leaving here aside the variations of the so-called German and Spanish manuscripts—it has been thought that this enigma can only be solved on the hypothesis of deriving all our Old Testament manuscripts from one individual archetype. And one of our greatest orientalists even undertook to prove whence this archetype. Sixty years after the destruction of Jerusalem the Jews of Palestine once more arose in a bloody insurrection against the Roman power. They were headed by a Pseudo-Messiah, who, after the prophecy of Balaam (Numb. 24 : 17) called himself Bar Cochba, "son of the star." After an obstinate struggle he was obliged

to retire with his people to the fortress Bether. On the ninth day of Ab, on the same day on which soldiers of Titus had thrown fire into the Herodian temple, it was taken by the Romans. Five hundred and eighty thousand Jews are said to have perished then. That archetype, Lagarde thinks, has been saved from the catastrophe of Bether. This is a vain conception, which in no wise can be made historically acceptable.*

Our Hebrew text is rather the result of a quiet work of the Jewish scribes, especially of the first centuries of our era, maturing by degrees. It represents the relatively best text, which can be historically established, but it is by no means the original text. As to the proportion in which it deviates from the same, we can only make conjectures but we have no certainty.

How is it with the text of the *New* Testament, which, as is well known, was written in the Greek language? Only a few years ago a rumor went round in different papers that one of the epistles of the apostle Peter has been recovered in his original. Numerous as are the surprises which were bestowed on the science of our days by the discoveries in old historical ground, a manuscript of the apostle will surely never be seen. Already Irenaeus, toward the end of the second century, while endeavoring to solve the enigma of the number 666 (Apocal. 13 : 18), could only consult copies,† and neither he nor other

*[Lagarde is not the only one who believes in an archetype. Lagarde's view is expressed in his *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien*, Leipsic, 1863, p. 2. Thirty years before Lagarde, E. F. K. Rosenmüller in the preface to the Hebrew Bible published by Tauchnitz, Leipsic, 1834, already wrote the following: "Qui hodie exstant codices omnes ita inter se conspirant, ut ex aliquot centenis variis lectionibus vix una deprehendatur, quae sensum mutet. Circa unam duntaxat vel alteram literam, vocalem vel accentum versantur. Quod quidem argumento est, O. T. libros, prouti eos nunc legimus, ex unius quam dicunt recensionis codicibus ad nos transmissos esse, atque omnes codices, antiquiores aeque qui perierunt, ac recentiores quos habemus, tamquam e communi fonte fluxisse." The same view is held by Kamphausen in the 3d ed. of Bleek's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 733, note; by Wellhausen in the 4th ed. of same work, p. 620 seq.; by Stade in his Hebrew Grammar, p. 20 and *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, p. 32. The most recent exponent of this view is Robertson Smith in his *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (New York 1883), p. 74 seq.—Tr.]

†[*Adv. Haeres*, v, 30, 1.—Tr.]

fathers of the first centuries know anything of the existence of the apostolic autographs. And this is not surprising. In the time of the apostles, as a rule they wrote on paper, which is also expressly mentioned in the second epistle of St. John (v. 12). This was a very perishable material, since the "charta Augusta," on account of being fine, was especially used in letter-writing. Now it is true that some Egyptian papyri have been preserved, which as has been proved are older than four thousand years. But during all this time they remained intact in the dry, dead-chambers of Egypt, which shut out the destroying dampness. The New Testament paper manuscripts, on the other hand, circulated from hand to hand, may be also from congregation to congregation. True there also existed parchment. You remember perhaps the passage in the second epistle to Timothy (4 : 13), in which Paul asks Timothy to bring with him the parchments. But the parchment then used was of a finer, less durable kind. Thus you will not be surprised to learn, that our oldest manuscripts of the New Testament do certainly not reach back beyond the middle of the fourth century. From *that* time on parchment was exclusively used, and this was stronger, more durable than the former.

I hardly need to remark that the New Testament—already during the first centuries of the Christian Church—has often been copied. True, relatively seldom the entire New Testament. Generally the manuscripts contained either the gospels, or the Pauline epistles, or the Acts of the Apostles with the catholic epistles, or finally the Revelation. Manuscripts containing the whole New Testament (and to this class, we are happy to say, belong our very oldest and most valuable ones), generally also contain the Old Testament in the Greek translation of the Septuagint, the oldest among them, also some other writings as the epistle of Barnabas and the shepherd of Hermas, which, besides our New Testament writings, were then in ecclesiastical use.

The manuscripts written until the tenth century, are written with large letters, and are therefore called "codices majusculae," or uncial manuscripts. Of such 65 have been preserved, cer-

tainly few considering what was once extant, but nevertheless a very magnificent number, when we bear in mind that of the entire comprehensive Greek literature hardly one tenth of as many manuscripts of equal antiquity have come down to us. Finally we also have more than 1200 minuscle manuscripts from the ninth to the sixteenth century. Many of them are already written on cotton—or linen paper and in book form (instead of the older roll form.)

Of this large number of manuscripts not two do agree with each other. The variations number by thousands; few verses of the New Testament only will be read alike in all manuscripts. What the manuscripts prove, the numerous New Testament citations in the writings of the Church-fathers confirm, and no less the oldest translations of the New Testament into Latin and into the Egyptian and Semitic dialects. They all also prove how fluctuating the text was read. On the other hand we must not omit to mention expressly that the critical material which is thus presented to us by manuscripts, translations and quotations in the Patristic literature, must be regarded as so complete that no passage of the New Testament which is not disputed by the same, can no more be looked upon as doubtful as to its originality.

The complaint over a corrupt text is as old as the text itself. Already the oldest writings which quote New Testament passages, show a corrupt text. The judgment of the Church-fathers is unanimous. Let us hear what Origen (in the first half of the third century) says in his commentary on the gospel of Matthew: "In the copies (of the New Testament) we have a great many various readings; they may either come from the carelessness of the copyists, or from the boldness of such, who endeavored to correct the text in a bad manner, or finally from the copyists who omitted or added at random."

Of late it has been taught to divide the extant manuscripts into certain groups. The oldest belong to the so-called Alexandrino-Egyptian family. They offer a text, which was especially used by the Jewish Christians of the Orient. To it belong the Codex Vaticanus at Rome, probably the most valuable and oldest of all our manuscripts; also the so-called Sinaitic manu-

script discovered by Tischendorf in the Catharine-Convent of Mount Sinai (the only complete manuscript now extant), now the main ornament of the Imperial public library at St. Petersburg.

Another group is usually called the "Latin" or "Western" family, though its text also originated in the Orient. To it belong the old Græco-Latin manuscripts, as well as the text which forms the basis of the old Latin translation, the origin of which may be traced back to the second century.

A third group is nominated the Græco-Asiatic family. The text which this group offers seems to go back to a recension, which was made, on the basis of a comparison of manuscripts, in the Syrian Church. May be that the presbyter Lucian of Antioch (†311), a founder of the famous school at Antioch deserved greatly of this recension. It was afterwards officially recognized in the Byzantine State-Church, and is hence the basis of the now received text of the Greek Church. The same text also found its way to the west; we find it in all more recent manuscripts. The manuscripts, too, which Erasmus made the basis of his edition of the New Testament of the year 1516, offer the same text. From this edition proceeded Luther's translation.

It cannot be my object to demonstrate to you, how modern textual criticism on the basis of the existing material has endeavored to restore the original text as far as possible. In spite of the thousands of various readings it has succeeded in clearing our Greek text more and more from received mistakes. And we may say, that in some writings, as in the epistle to the Romans, there will hardly be found any important readings, which are still disputed. To be sure, if you would compare one of our more recent critical editions, like the so-called eighth of Tischendorf's text, or the still more excellent one of Westcott and Hort, with the text of Luther, you would see how radical are some of the changes which were made in the text; how necessary it was to remove from the New Testament such sections as spurious which have become dear to some. But the scientific theologian has the duty to act in accordance with the well-known saying of Tertullian: "Christ has not called himself the custom, but the truth."

I will now demonstrate by a series of passages what has been done and is still to be done by the work of textual criticism, and how far-reaching are some of the changes, which the text of the New Testament has experienced with the time. Only certain results of criticism will I lay before you. Many things must remain to us uncertain for ever. I also omit all the numerous instances which only concern errors in writing or hearing or seeing, and only such instances do I include within the circle of our observations, which concern wilful changes on the side of the copyists. For punctilious clinging to the letter, which distinguished the later Jewish theology, or even the scientific conscientiousness of the exegete, who only cares for the literal sense and the meaning of the author, we must not expect of any of the copyists of the New Testament.

We may yet overlook the fact of which Tatian already complained (about 150 A. D.) that many copyists took the liberty of making all kinds of stylistic emendations in the apostolic texts. No less frequently, however, were also essential corrections, or additions and omissions, of which Origen already complained. Thus, for instance, the first three gospels—the so-called synoptic—were almost throughout arbitrarily supplemented from the parallel accounts, which they offer. The Lord's Prayer in Luther's Bible is given in Luke 11, in essentially the same form as in Matt. 6. Yet the oldest codices teach us, that the third and seventh petition did not belong to the original text of Luke's gospel. By Matthew again we read the familiar clause at the end "for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever. Amen." But Matthew, as the oldest critical witnesses tell, did not write it down, nor did the Lord teach it to his disciples. It has been arbitrarily added by the copyists of Matthew's gospel, probably because it became customary at a very early time in the service of the ancient Church, to add to the Lord's Prayer this liturgical close.

The narrative of the woman taken in adultery in John ch. 8, is certainly no original constituent part of the gospel. It was probably written at first in the margin to 8 : 15, to illustrate the word of Jesus, "Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man," and was afterwards thoughtlessly received into the text of the gospel

by subsequent copyists. I say thoughtlessly, because the narrative interrupts in the most striking manner the connection of the narrative of the events on the Feast of Tabernacles. That this story moreover rests on ancient, truthful tradition, I will not deny at all. Less probable is this the case with the entire close of Mark's gospel from 16 : 9 seq. According to the result of textual criticism this must be erased as spurious. The very fact even that Irenæus already read the passage, cannot help us any, for the Vatican and Sinaitic codices have it not yet and other ancient codices have it in an essentially different form, proof enough that it was added only for the sake of giving to Mark's gospel a suitable close, which it had not.

It is worthy of notice that as from Mark the mention of the ascension must be omitted, so likewise from Luke 24 : 51. For the words "and carried up into heaven," following after "and it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them" are according to the oldest witnesses not original. Thus then the fact of the ascension—and why should this not be sufficient for us?—remains expressly attested by the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles alone.*

An arbitrary and at the same time fabulous addition, which does not correspond to the otherwise biblical view has already been made in the oldest manuscripts to the narrative of the healing of the sick at the pool of Bethesda (John ch. 5). The words of the sick, "Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool," which simply suppose the fact of an intermitting spring, as may be still observed at the temple-mount, were the cause of the preceding addition that an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water, etc.

A very late addition of a dogmatical kind is offered by the famous passage 1 John 5 : 7 seq. in the words: "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." These words are not

*[In the Lutheran Church, Mark 16 : 14–20 is read as the gospel for Ascension Day, and sermons are generally preached on that text. The committee for revising Luther's Bible retained that section without any note or comment, and retained the old heading, "Gospel on Ascension Day."—Tr.]

only wanting in all Greek manuscripts before the year 1000, even Luther did not receive them into his translation. Indeed we do not strike out the confession of the holy Trinity, by eliminating these words from the text of the Bible. Since they are certainly not original, since Luther did not even have them in his translation, it is difficult to account for why they are again and again reprinted and are used in the Church as words of the apostle John.*

Let us now pass over to some arbitrary changes of the text, which were made by the copyists. This was done first of all in passages where it was intended to correct a seeming or real mistake. To this class belongs the famous verse Matt. 13 : 35. Jerome tells us that Porphyry, the dangerous Neo-Platonic adversary of Christianity, accused the evangelists of ignorance, because he quoted the words: "I will open my mouth in parables," etc., as words of Isaiah, while they are found in a psalm of Asaph. Porphyry seems to have to read in his manuscript "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet Isaiah, saying" (not simply "by the prophet," as in our German [and also in the English] text. The same we find in the codex Sinaiticus. Should the reading, as Tischendorf thinks, be genuine, we cannot but acknowledge that the apostle Matthew has erred here.

A similar slip of memory is certainly in Matt. 27 : 9; since the there quoted passage is found in Zechariah and not in Jeremiah, as according to almost all manuscripts (Luther too has correctly "Jeremiah"), the evangelist did write. Some manuscripts and translations have here too a correction, by erasing either "Jeremiah," or substituting Zechariah in its place.

In fine allow me to call your attention to two more passages, of which the one was altered in an ethico-ascetical interest, the other out of dogmatical considerations. In Mark 9 : 29 we read: "This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer and fasting." The addition "and fasting" is wanting in the Vatican and Sinaitic codices, but was already added at a very early period

*[This verse forms part of the epistle for the first Sunday after Easter, called "Quasimodogenite." The revision-committee has retained it in the German Bible within brackets and distinguished it by a smaller type.—Tr.]

and generally adopted. It answered to the practical ascetical tendency of the Church; it opposes, however, entirely the evangelical free spirit of the Scripture.

One of the most remarkable changes, to which but recently a more earnest attention has been called, concerns the passage John 1 : 18. Here Luther* reads in conformity with the later manuscripts: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared *him*." But the oldest manuscripts, as well as all Greek Fathers of the first centuries, read instead of "the only begotten Son," the two Greek words "only begotten" and "God" (both without the article), which must not be translated "the only begotten God," but: he who is the only begotten (viz. Son) is and as such also God (in the predicative sense, in which we read John 1 : 1 of the eternal word, it was "God"). The reading which arose in the Western Church "the only begotten Son," is probably to explain out of dogmatical anxiety; it was feared that the expression found in the original text, might be misunderstood. Or was it not understood at all? At any rate we have here an instance, in which the work of textual criticism has restored a confession of the divinity of Christ, as the apostolic pen wrote it.†

From the last example you see that the critical labor does by no means endanger the contents of doctrine and faith of the Holy Scripture, as it could appear from the other striking and intentionally chosen examples. You will also have become persuaded that from the received matter of fact it is the object and duty of the theologian, to examine without prejudice the critical witnesses in order to come nearer and nearer to the original text of the Scripture. But you will also have received the impres-

*[So also the A. and Revised Version, and the Revised German.—Tr.]

†[Schaff in his *Companion to the Greek Testament and English Version*, p. 432, says: "*God* only begotten" was originally adopted by the Revisers in the text (as in Westcott and Hort), but afterward relegated to the margin, and the common reading, 'the only begotten Son' retained in the text (as in Tischendorf, and as suggested by the American Committee). The evidence is nearly equally balanced." Comp. also p. 194 seq.—Tr.]

sion, that it is not only difficult, but absolutely impossible, to restore everywhere the original text of the Scripture.

Shall this fact make us despair of the truth of the contents of the Scripture. No, certainly not. Only of a mechanical, legal, dead conception of the Scripture, which the evangelical theologian, who follows Luther's bold and courageous faith, must reject. I repeat, what I said at the beginning: The Scripture is not *the* revelation of God. If such were the case, then every "and" and "but," every name and every number would be the word of God. Then, to be sure, we would have despairingly to complain of the corruption of the text and think, what an anxious little faith often enough had thought, that a corrupt Bible-text can no more be rule and guide of faith and life. Indeed, then we would have to expect and to ask out and out of the Scripture, that it would have been preserved to us unchanged in its letter through divine providence. But the Scripture shows the image of him, of whom it testifies (John 5 : 39). It has a divine and a human side: a divine, because it is and remains to the simple belief the unchangeable authentic testimony of the great deeds of God; a human, for men are its authors, and it was transmitted by fallible men to later generations, in ways and by means, not different from those, by which all other literature of antiquity has come down to us.

## ARTICLE IV.

### THE AMERICAN INTER-SEMINARY MISSIONARY ALLIANCE.

By Rev. William E. Hull, A. B., Hudson, N. Y.

The American Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance has become a permanent factor among the evangelical institutions of the Christian Church of America. But little has appeared in our church periodicals in reference to it. An account of the origin and aim of this association and the attitude of the Lutheran Church to it may be of interest to many readers, and also may be of much advantage to the Alliance in the furtherance of its desire to bring all the orthodox seminaries of our land into one common bond of union in the prosecution of a work in which all are deeply interested—and none more so than the Lutheran Church.

The movement originated during the year 1879 among the students of the theological seminary at Princeton, and sprang from a desire for some co-operation of theological students in the various seminaries in promoting the cause of missions. At about the same time the students of the theological seminary at Hartford, moved by a similar impulse, addressed a circular letter upon the same subject to the students of various seminaries. After considerable correspondence between the members of different institutions, the holding of an Inter-Seminary Convention was deemed the most feasible of the various plans suggested, for the accomplishment of the ends in view. In response to a letter sent from Princeton a preliminary conference was held in New York city, April 9th, 1880, at which twenty-two delegates, representing twelve seminaries, were present. Other seminaries sent letters approving the general plan. This preliminary convention adopted a resolution to hold an inter-seminary convention for the discussion of themes bearing on the relation which we are to sustain to the work of Home and Foreign Missions, whether we labor as missionaries abroad, or as pastors at home.

In pursuance to a call of the executive committee, created at

this preliminary convention, the first annual convention of the American Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance assembled in the Second Reformed church in New Brunswick, N. J., Thursday, October 21st, 1880, at 2.45 P. M., where the delegates were received by an address of welcome, by Rev. Dr. Woodbridge, of the New Brunswick Theological Seminary.

The writer, after much correspondence, at last succeeded in obtaining an account of the first convention, which was published in a missionary magazine, entitled *The Gospel in all Lands*, (November, 1880)—copies of which are very scarce. We therefore include the representation, organization and declarations of this first convention.

The committee on enrollment reported the following seminaries represented, with the number of students present from each: Allegheny Seminary (Covenanter), Allegheny, Pa., 1; United Presbyterian Seminary, Allegheny, Pa., 1; Western Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Allegheny, Pa., 3; Andover Seminary (Congregational), Andover, Mass., 10; Auburn Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Auburn, N. Y., 6; Bates College (Free Baptist), Lewiston, Me., 1; Boston University (Methodist), Boston, Mass., 3; Chicago Baptist Seminary, Chicago, Ills., 2; Chicago Congregational Seminary, Chicago, Ills., 2; Presbyterian Seminary of the North West, Chicago, Ills., 2; Crozer Theological Seminary (Baptist), Chester, Pa., 8; Danville Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Danville, Ky., 2; Drew Theological Seminary (Methodist), Madison, N. J., 23; Garrett Biblical Institute (Methodist), Evanston, Ills., 2; German Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Bloomfield, N. J., 1; Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., 1; Madison University, Theological Department (Baptist), Hamilton, N. Y., 2; Hartford Theological Seminary (Congregational), Hartford, Conn., 5; Knox College (Presbyterian), Toronto, Canada, 2; Reformed Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa., 2; Lane Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Cincinnati, Ohio, 1; Lincoln Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Oxford, Pa., 3; Reformed Theological Seminary (Reformed Dutch), New Brunswick, N. J., 34; Newton Theological Seminary (Baptist) Newton Centre, Mass., 3; Oberlin Theological Seminary (Congregational), Ober-

lin, Ohio, 1; Princeton Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Princeton, N. J., 64; Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va., 4; Rochester Theological Seminary (Baptist), Rochester, N. Y., 2; Union Theological Seminary (Southern Presbyterian), Hampden-Sidney, Va., 1; Yale Theological Seminary (Congregational), New Haven, Conn., 7. Total Seminaries, 31. Total denominations, 11. Total students, 242.

The committee on permanent organization presented the following report:

1. This organization shall be called "The American Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance."

2. The aim of this Alliance shall be the furtherance of practical interest in, and consecration to, Foreign and Home Missions on the part of theological students, both as prospective missionaries and prospective pastors.

3. All evangelical theological seminaries which, through their delegates present at any convention, or in any other way, shall express a desire and readiness to coöperate for the furtherance of the aim of this Alliance, as set forth in article 2d, shall, upon application to the correspondence and publication committee, provided for in article 6th, be recognized as members of this Alliance.

4. At each convention, this Alliance shall determine the time and place for its next convention.

5. All business connected with the holding of the conventions of this Alliance, shall be placed in the hands of a convention committee. This committee shall be composed of five members, from different denominations, and shall hold office until the election of their successors by the convention next following.

6. There shall be a correspondence and publication committee, composed, elected, and retaining office similarly with the convention committee. It shall be the duty of this committee: First, to collect from theological seminaries, to publish, and to circulate amongst the seminaries, all information of interest to the Alliance; Second, to encourage the organization of missionary societies in seminaries, and to stimulate those already

existing to increased efficiency; and, Third, to take such other measures as are calculated to further the ends of this Alliance. This committee shall have power to appoint such sub-committee as they shall deem necessary to aid them in their work.

7. These articles of organization may be altered or supplemented by a two-thirds vote of the seminaries represented in any regular convention of this Alliance, provided that every seminary of this Alliance has been notified, through the correspondence and publishing committee, of the proposed change, at least two months before the meeting of that convention.

The committee on resolutions made the following report:

We the representatives of the American Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance, in convention assembled, clasping hands and exchanging greetings in the close bond of a common service and a common hope, desire to give expression to our interest and sympathy in the missionary work of the Church by the following resolutions:

1. That the addresses and discussions of this convention, have given us a more profound and intelligent appreciation of the importance of missionary work at home and abroad.

2. That the divine command, "Go, ye!" standing, as it does, between the assurances of omnipotence and omnipresence; the example of our Divine Master himself, the great missionary of the race; the inspiring success of missionary effort throughout the past; the present unparalleled prosperity of Christian missions; the opening doors of eastern empires; the aggressions of Romanism and infidelity, with all their attendant evils; and, above all, the burning love for immortal souls in every Christian heart;—all these unite in impressing upon us the solemn, earnest, individual appeal to consecrate ourselves to the work of discipling the nations.

3. That we, therefore, call upon ourselves, and those whom we represent, to look with conscientious and prayerful scrutiny upon any reason why we should not aspire to the honor of joining those who have given their lives to the grandest enterprise that any age has inaugurated,—the reclaiming of a world to Christ.

4. That we are resolved, that, by divine grace, wheresoever our lot may be cast, we will not be indifferent to, or neglectful

in regard to the claims of missionary work, and the means of promoting its success.

5. That the students of the theological seminaries, represented in this Alliance, take this opportunity to extend a hearty "God-speed" to all missionaries throughout the world; and to assure them of our sincerest interest and prayers in behalf of their momentous work.

6. That the thanks of this convention are heartily tendered to the business committee, whose untiring labors have resulted in this successful and enthusiastic meeting; to the students of the New Brunswick Seminary, who have so kindly invited us to this place, and provided for our entertainment; to the churches which have so generously afforded us the use of their edifices; to the good people of New Brunswick, who have so hospitably opened to us their homes and their hearts; to the railroad companies, for their courtesy in furnishing us passage at reduced rates; and to those individuals, who, by solicitation and donation, have aided in defraying the expenses of this convention.

Papers were read on the following subjects:

"The benefits which the Church at home has derived from missions," by Rev. Wm. M. Taylor, D. D., of New York city; "Missionary work in Italy," by Rev. L. M. Vernon, D. D., of Italy; "The individual appeal and the individual answer," by Rev. Arthur T. Pierson, D. D., of Detroit; "Pastoral responsibility for missions," by Rev. H. M. Scudder, D. D., of Brooklyn; "How may a pastor interest his people in missions?" by Rev. Edward Judson, D. D., of Orange, N. J.; "The Church fundamentally a missionary society," by Mr. W. I. Haven, of Boston Seminary; "The indifference of the Church to the world's evangelization," by Mr. G. N. Luccock, of Allegheny Seminary; "Secular testimony to the success of missions," by Mr. C. M. Cady; "Scope for the best, and most diverse talents, and culture, in missionary work," by Mr. S. J. Harmeling, of New Brunswick Seminary; "The right attitude of young men to the home mission work," by Mr. J. E. Perry, of Crozer Seminary; "Impulses given to missions by theological students," by Mr. Robert Thompson, of Union Seminary; "The present claims of foreign missions upon young men," by Mr. J. G.

Shackelford, of Va.; "What constitutes a call to the mission work," by Mr. F. L. Neeld, of Drew Seminary; "Missionary work and interest in theological seminaries," by Mr. R. M. Mateer, of Princeton Seminary.

The Sunday meetings were as follows:

At 8.30 a meeting of missionaries, and those who expected to go out as missionaries; at 9.00 a consecration meeting; at 10.30 missionary sermons were preached in the various churches; at 2.00 a social meeting of missionaries and those intending to go as missionaries; at 3.15 a missionary mass meeting, at which addresses were made by Rev. Dr. C. W. Mateer, of China, Rev. Narayan Sheshadri, of India, and Rev. Dr. C. H. Fowler, of New York; at night Rev. A. J. Gordon, D. D., of Boston, preached on "The indwelling of the Holy Spirit." A consecration meeting of the students, led by Rev. Dr. Gordon, held after the sermon, closed the convention at New Brunswick. At this convention Mr. O. C. Roth, of Gettysburg Seminary, was made a member of the committee on resolutions.

I have stated the above facts at some length to give an idea of the extended scope and work of the Alliance. In the minutes of the succeeding conventions I find the following facts in reference to Lutheran affiliation and representation:

At the second convention, held at Allegheny City, Pa., October, 1881, Gettysburg, Hartwick and Wittenberg were enrolled as members of the Alliance. Gettysburg only furnished two delegates, viz., Luther Kuhlman and M. F. Troxell—the former acting as a member of the correspondence and publication committee, and the latter as chairman of committee on bills and overtures. Under the heading, "Seminaries represented in the Alliance, and members of sub-committee," I find the following: L. Kuhlman for Gettysburg, B. E. Fake for Hartwick and J. N. Lenker for Wittenberg.

At the third convention, held at Chicago, October, 1882, Mr. L. B. Wolff, of Gettysburg, was the only delegate enrolled from the Lutheran Church. On Friday evening of this convention an address was delivered by Rev. S. A. Ort, D. D., of Wittenberg, on the theme "*Jesus only.*" Roanoke was added to the Alliance at this convention.

At the fourth convention, held at Hartford, Conn., October, 1883, Messrs. Geo. D. Gotwald, W. P. Swartz, S. J. Taylor, J. L. Metzger, W. E. Stahler, and C. R. Trowbridge were delegates from Gettysburg. No other Lutheran seminary was represented. W. P. Swartz was appointed a member of committee on enrollment. On Saturday A. M., the 27th, W. E. Stahler read a paper on "How to arouse and maintain missionary interest in the churches."

At the fifth convention, held at Princeton, N. J., October, 1884, Geo. D. Gotwald, F. H. Crissman, W. H. Jordy, L. M. Kuhns, C. J. McDaniel and C. R. Trowbridge represented Gettysburg and W. E. Hull, Hartwick. C. T. McDaniel of Gettysburg was made a member of the executive committee and W. E. Hull, of Hartwick, one of the permanent secretaries of the convention. Geo. D. Gotwald was made a member of the committee on bills and overtures, and the committee on correspondence and publication made the following complimentary mention of him in their report: "We had hoped for several more additions from seminaries which we have urged to unite with us. In this connection we must recognize the valuable aid of brother Geo. D. Gotwald, of Gettysburg Seminary." It was through the influence of brother Gotwald that the writer of this article was induced to attend this convention.

At the sixth convention, held at Rochester, N. Y., October, 1885, C. T. Aikens, S. J. Derr, S. G. Dornblaser, F. H. Crissman, C. L. Fleck, C. B King, C. T. McDaniel, M. E. McLinn, C. Reinewald, C. H. Schnur and H. L. Yarger represented Gettysburg, and W. E. Hull, Hartwick Seminary. Mr. H. L. Yarger of Gettysburg was appointed chairman at the Saturday morning session. W. E. Hull of Hartwick was made a member of the committee on correspondence and publication. In the roll of seminaries, Missionary Institute, of Selinsgrove, Pa., appears for the first time and Roanoke has dropped out.

It will be seen by the above that all the seminaries of the General Synod have become identified with the Alliance, but there is a lack of proper interest in having well organized missionary societies which will send delegates to each convention.

No seminaries have been represented by delegates at any of the conventions, except Gettysburg and Hartwick. Gettysburg has done *nobly*. But the excuse may be set forth by some of our seminaries that their theological departments are small and it is difficult to provide for the traveling expenses of delegates. Now, one word in regard to this. Where there is a will there is a way. Brother Geo. D. Gotwald wrote me that the plan at Gettysburg was to call upon some of the pastors, friends of the seminary, to have a small collection taken in several churches for this purpose. You will see by the above account that Gettysburg furnished eleven delegates to the last convention. Having obtained permission at Hartwick from the Missionary Society, I sent out a circular for the same purpose and received a light response (probably from the fact that few of our pastors were familiar with the operations of the Alliance), yet enough to pay fare to Princeton and return. Indeed, it was one of the grandest experiences of my life to meet with over 400 young men from the seminaries of our land—all interested in that kingdom which is eternal and in those things which are spiritual. And there still lingers within me a thrill of lofty emotion as I recall the closing session, when the separation was at hand, and many would see each others faces no more upon the earth, and all voices united in repeating the Apostles' Creed and, with bowed heads, the Lord's Prayer, after which hands clasping hands of each other and voice blending with voice in that grand old hymn—

> "Blest be the tie that binds,
> Our hearts in Christian love,
> The fellowship of kindred minds
> Is like to that above,"

until there seemed to fall a benediction from heaven, which made the spirit strong and nerved each heart for the struggles of the future.

Now, the above-mentioned plan in reference to collections seems to be simple and ought to receive the attention of our pastors, but the response (yet we are very grateful to those who did respond) came so feebly to my appeal, that it was not pursued again at Hartwick Seminary. The delegate last fall at

Rochester defrayed his own expenses that the seminary might be represented. There can be a small fund secured in the meetings of the Missionary Society by occasional collections among the members themselves by which money can be secured for this purpose, and if the Alliance convention happens to be far away send only one delegate, but, if near, more.

Now, I have had a great interest in the Alliance since I became associated with it, and it is my duty as member of the correspondence and publication committee of the present year to call the attention of our denomination to the necessity of a more vigorous interest. Mr. G. K. Frazer, of Auburn Seminary, chairman of the correspondence and publication committee last year met with the incoming committee at Rochester before the adjournment of the convention and, after specifying the general duties of the committee, said: "You will find most difficulty in getting a representation from the Evangelical Lutheran and from the Protestant Episcopal Church (South)." We certainly should not be lagging behind all the other denominations in this great work, because it certainly is a means of education to all our young men, who are to go into our congregations. Indeed there might be much less trouble for our boards of home and foreign missions to raise money for missionary purposes, if our pastors could have been more thoroughly instructed in the great importance of this work, when they were yet undergraduates.

All cannot attend conventions, but the delegates bring the "good news" back, and, in addition to their reports, printed reports of each convention, containing minutes of the proceedings of the convention and all the addresses and papers printed in full with synopses of discussions, also reports of committees and the enrollment roll with valuable statistics of each seminary. At the last convention $40 were appropriated by the Alliance for extra copies of the report for gratuitous distribution among the missionaries and clergy of different denominations. As a member of the correspondence and publication committee I have over 50 copies of the last session's report to distribute and will be glad to forward to those who are interested and will apply for a copy to me. Apropos I will add that these reports are ordered by the delegates for themselves and their seminary

societies at each session of the convention at 35 cents apiece, and therefore those receiving the reports of each session from year to year pay for them personally and thereby obtain a compendium of missionary knowledge. The last report is an octavo of 132 pages.

That there may be a clear idea of the function of the committee on correspondence and publication I will make some excerpts from the report of the first committee appointed, which reported at Allegheny City in 1881—copies of which printed report are very scarce.

### I. ORGANIZATION AND AIM.

The organization of this committee was the expression of a need that was felt and appreciated by the first convention of the Alliance. This need was two-fold, that of concentration and diffusion.

The different members of the Alliance scarcely knew of the existence of other seminaries not of their creed, and much less of the seminaries themselves. Standing on the broad basis of the world's evangelization, the denominational lines could be lost sight of and a desirable end could be gained by coming into contact with, and learning of, each other. By establishing a bond of sympathy between the theological schools, through the medium of correspondence, it was hoped that the missionary spirit might be focalized. This committee was to be the lens of the Alliance catching and retaining all the convergent rays of inter-seminary missionary intelligence.

But not only was the committee to concentrate, it was also to diffuse. The items of work and interest in the several seminaries needed to be brought to the notice of other seminaries for their encouragement and profit. The coal of missionary spirit that glows brightly in some institutions needed to touch the cold indifferentism that is found in others. Therefore, this lens was not merely to focus and hold the spirit of missionary enterprise that it gathered from various sources, but it was also to send forth again in divergent rays among the theological seminaries of the land this fervent spirit. Such were the prominent needs that led to the formation of this committee; the

need of a careful gathering to be followed by a prudent scattering.

The means proposed to this committee by which to meet these needs were also two-fold in character. The articles of organization adopted by the Alliance required that the committee "collect from theological seminaries all information of interest to the Alliance, to publish and circulate among the seminaries all information of interest to the seminaries; and to urge the formation of missionary societies where not existing and to stimulate to increased efficiency those already formed." In a word, the means were those of publication and correspondence. Hence the name with which the committee was christened. As a collateral aid to its working, power was given to the committee to appoint such sub-committees as were deemed necessary to the better carrying out of its aim. Thus was organized this focalizing power in the Alliance, which was expected to use type and pen in the accomplishment of its work. Its aim was not theoretical only, but practical in the highest and truest sense.

To imbue theological students with a more earnest and devoted consecration to the work of executing the great commission, was the ultimate end and aim both of this committee and of the Alliance which it in part represented.

## II. PRACTICAL WORKING.

With a plain statement of facts and figures we will endeavor to portray as nearly as possible the inside working of the committee.

First, dividing the members of Alliance and the outside seminaries along denominational lines as far as possible, each member of the committee took his quota of institutions and entered into correspondence with them. Members of the Alliance were requested to elect or appoint a student to serve as sub-committee of the central committee. Non-members of the Alliance in the United States and Canada were addressed and urged to enroll their names among its membership. The fruit of this correspondence we consider under the head of Results. To each member of the Alliance there was then sent a letter requesting articles for publication. The editors of several religious news-

papers and missionary periodicals were interviewed and space was secured for the insertion of articles received by the committee. At the opening of the present seminary year letters were sent to each member of the Alliance urging the importance of large delegations to the convention and asking for letters of greeting in case representation by delegates was impossible. During the year the committee also distributed through the Alliance various documents furnished by missionary boards. These are the main outlines of the practical working of the committee. Itself an experiment, its work largely pioneer, there were obstacles to overcome and difficulties to be met that will not likely occur to perplex and hinder its successors. Permit, however, a personal word. In all the perplexities of an untried work, carried on amid the ever pressing duties of seminary life, there has been no friction. The most cordial fraternal feeling has characterized all our deliberations. There has been no shirking of details and no serious clashing of opinions. Every personal ambition has been sunk in the grand aim which centers in the Master whose cause we have thus tried to advance. If the aims of the founder of this committee have not been fully realized, it can be shown that some of them were impracticable with the means under the control of the committee.

### III. MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.

Of the 35 seminaries reporting missionary societies, one holds a bi-monthly meeting, 25 hold monthly, 4 semi-monthly and 4 weekly meetings. The character of these meetings is much the same in all. Addresses or papers on missionary topics are presented by returned missionaries, secretaries of mission boards, members of the seminary faculty or students, with prayer for the field thus brought to notice. One Seminary—Hartford (Cong.)—has both a monthly meeting and a weekly missionary prayer meeting. In Oberlin (Cong.) a missionary band comprised of students personally consecrated and pledged to mission work holds weekly meetings. Thirty-three seminaries report a positive benefit received from the last convention. This benefit is mainly in an increased missionary spirit in the institution, as shown in greater interest in missions and a disposition

more thoroughly to consider its personal claims. Those reporting no benefit are, with one exception, seminaries not represented at the first convention.

IV. RESULTS.

1. *Publication.*—These are meagre. The articles of organization were inserted in a few religious newspapers. An article by a pastor in Michigan, on "The Great Home Field," was published in the New York *Evangelist*, which kindly furnished slips of the article for distribution among the Alliance. A few other articles were inserted in other papers. Regarding publication, the committee found just the reverse of what it expected. The overwhelming flood of articles that was expected from the semnaries did not come. Letters from missionaries and items of missionary intelligence that had been requested did not appear. Thus we are obliged to report that our efforts as a publication committee were not entirely successful. To publish the proceedings of this convention in pamphlet form properly belongs to the province of this committee. This has been secured through a Pittsburgh firm under our supervision.

2. *Correspondence.*—Here we report the most tangible results. Besides kindling a fraternal feeling among the members of the Alliance, it has furnished facts and statistics that are of interest and importance not only to the Alliance, but to the whole Christian world. Of the the 133 theological seminaries and schools in the United States reported in the latest Educational Report, (1879), 2 are suspended, 12 are non-evangelical, 17 Roman Catholic, and 102 evangelical; 46 of these 102 are members of the Alliance, and represent 15 denominations. Of this number one has withdrawn—Allegheny (Covenanter)—on purely denominational grounds, and one has been dropped—Knox College (Canada)—through failure to respond to repeated correspondence. To the remaining original 29 there have been added 17 seminaries representing 5 denominations. It is but just to say that the figures regarding the number of seminaries in the United States are misleading. The Alliance represents the large majority of theological students in our country. We have the backbone of theological strength in all evangelical de-

nominations. (L. Kuhlman, of Gettysburg, was a member of the committee making the above report.)

In closing I will quote a portion of the report of the committee on resolutions from the same convention report as the above, so as to give an impress of its fervency and consecration:

"That devout thanks be rendered to God for the kind providence which conducted us hither, and has permitted us to assemble and to continue uninterruptedly in convention; for the gift of the Holy Spirit, whose presence and power we have felt throughout our convention, and for the spirit of harmony and brotherly love which has pervaded all our sessions.

That we have a profound sense of the advantages we have derived from this convention; that the eloquent addresses and animated discussions have impressed us, as we have not been impressed before, and have given us new ardor to enlist ourselves in a work so mighty and so promising; that the stirring appeals of those who have, even during this convention, pledged themselves to the work of missions have led each of us to examine more carefully our own individual duty in this direction; that the meeting together of so many brethren, of different denominations and from different states, has inspired us with a more catholic spirit, and has shown us more fully that we are members of one common brotherhood, engaged in the one common cause of evangelizing the world.

That the view afforded us of the present state of Protestant missions causes us 'to thank God and take courage,' while the magnitude of the missionary field, the marvelous manner in which Providence is opening up this field for aggressive missionary effort and the imperative demand for immediative action call for increased activity and liberality on the part of all God's people.

That the members of this Alliance consecrate themselves anew to the work of the Gospel, with full submission to the will of our Master, determining by the grace of God to preach Christ faithfully, at home or abroad, as God may direct, and that we call upon all students for the ministry all over our land to join us in this consecration.

That we urge the importance of this Alliance, and its annual

conventions upon the attention of our theological seminaries; that we solicit the hearty co-operation of other seminaries which have not yet joined the Alliance; that we appeal to our seminaries to send larger delegations to the annual conventions, in order that the interest of the conventions may be augmented and that the value of the Alliance to individual seminaries may be increased by the greater number of those whose missionary enthusiasm shall be kindled at the altars of the convention.

That, in order to give the widest possible scope to the influence of this convention, we deem it of great importance to secure an extensive circulation of the convention report. And, therefore, that earnest effort be made by the members of this convention and urged upon all theological students, to place copies of this report in the hands of pastors and all Christian workers.

That to the multitude of Christian missionaries now laboring in home and foreign fields we extend a cordial greeting and we bid them an earnest 'God speed.' Expressing also our profound sympathy with them in every phase of their trying yet glorious work, our joy at the constantly multiplying evidences of their increasing success, and our promise of all that support and encouragement of which the existence of this Alliance is itself the abundant pledge."

The next annual convention of the Alliance will meet at Oberlin, Ohio, during the latter part of October, 1886.

## ARTICLE V.

### BOURDALOUE.

By Rev. H. H. Hall, A. M., Millersburg, Ohio.

There is an artistry in every calling of life to which a man may constantly have an eye. Louis XIV. aimed to be a king in every sense of the word, and Guizot closes the portion of history relating to his reign with this significant sentence: "In spite of his faults and his numerous and culpable errors, Louis XIV. had lived and died like a king."

The character of Louis had in it a strange mixture of qualities. He was comely in person, pompous and majestic in bearing, yet kind and accessible to his people. He was ambitious, proud, and in all his thoughts and acts himself was everything, yet there always continued to be at bottom of his nature a sincere honesty of purpose. He put immense stress upon mere show. On account of the splendor of his camp and soldiery, his enemies in Europe styled him "the king of reviews." He was remarkable for his follies. It was common, in his time, to say of the young coxcomb, unusually vain and pretentious in gait: "He can strut like the king of France." "Louis Baboon" was Swift's jesting word for Louis Bourbon. And, yet, he had an extraordinary fund of good, practical, common sense. This last attribute, together with his industry won for him his reputation. It is no wonder that when the news of his death reached England it was disputed at the coffee houses, whether the late king was most like Augustus Cæsar or Nero. Taking him all in all, however, he was just and noble in sentiment; he had much that is lovable in character; his reign was a magnificent one, and he was justly entitled to be called Louis the Great.

The mistakes of his government were largely due to his situation. It sometimes happens that a man is compelled by circumstances to adopt a course of action which is sure to be followed by many evils. It was so with Louis XIV. That is why his reign produced enormous quantities of bad and good. The

despotism of his rule he thought was necessary to retrench the excess of "licentiousness, confusion and disorder." And anyone viewing the subject in the light of after events will easily see that he judged right. Sainte-Beuve justifies him in what he declares of the effect of his rule upon the writers of his age. He says, there "would have been a freer literature in every sense than that which flourished under Louis XIV., and the eighteenth century would have been partially anticipated." "The young king came, and he brought along with him, he inspired his young literature ; he applied the proper corrective to the old, and, saving some brilliant exceptions, he impressed upon the mass of the productions of his time a solid, and finally a moral character which is also that which reigns in his own writings and the habit of his thought."

The sufferings of the people were great and terrible. Multitudes were reduced to beggary. Fifteen hundred thousand were driven by the persecutions of the monarch into disgrace, despair and exile. Indeed few reigns have been productive of more wretchedness and misery than that of Louis XIV. ; and when he died the state entered at last upon a long and dreadful agony which ended in the revolution. Yet, notwithstanding, there never was a more brilliant era of literature and art, politics and oratory. Splendid "buildments" under the supervision of that distinguished architect Perrault were planned and erected. Among painters were Le Poussin, Claude Lorrain, Lesuere and Lebrun. Colbert was the excellent minister of finance and Louvois of war. The names of illustrious poets and writers, and a brief account of them would fill a volume. There was "the great Corneille," Moliere, the equal of any writer of comedy in any age, the beautiful and tender Racine, De Retz, Fontaine, Boileau, "the monarch of literary criticism," the accomplished Pascal; Malebranche, the eccentric Mezerri who always sat by a burning candle even in the brightest day light, Madame Dacier who "though she was the most learned woman in Europe, yet her great learning did not alter her genteel air in conversation, or in the least appear in her discourse, which was easy, modest, and nothing affected," Madame de Sevigne, whose admirable letters give such lively pictures of her times and co-

temporaries, and many others. And of churchmen were Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Fenelon and Massillon.

Louis XIV. was not remarkable for intellect. He had little knowledge of letters and his early education was sadly neglected. It was more in his natural gift of good judgment, and his conscientiousness, which was back of what he wrote and said, that his excellence consisted. Montesquieu says: His soul was greater than his mind." But, while he was himself illiterate, he was the patron of scholars. Encouraged and sustained by Colbert, who had a high appreciation of learning, he gave pensions to the eminent literary men of Europe, and so distinguished his age more than any of all times for its gifted men and women.

The fact that the reign of Louis XIV. was so celebrated for great and powerful ecclesiastics very naturally suggests an inquiry as to the conditions under which eloquence flourishes most. It has been thought by a few writers that a free state alone makes the highest efforts of genius possible. There is no doubt but that liberty fills a man with hopes and aspirations which despotism only destroys. It affords him an opportunity to do his best. It expands and inspires; it loosens bound and latent energies and gives them speech and action. Slavery limits, binds, depresses. But it is not true that eloquence is confined alone to a state of freedom. On the other hand the desperateness of a man's situation often awakens every talent that is in him. The past has numerous instances of orators to whom oppression gave the golden tongue with which they won liberty for themselves and their native land. And surely the rule of Louis XIV. would have crushed out every vestige of oratorical genius. His government was more than arbitrary—it was Asiatic. Guizot declares that it is impossible to tell of anything in his time without referring constantly to Louis XIV. The monarch presents the character of his reign in his own words: "I resolved from the first not to leave to another the functions of king whilst I had nothing but the title." "I am the state" was his famous saying. He even undertook to rule the consciences of his people. Edict, custom, the personal wish and preference of others were nothing. It was complained that

pope, council, church, or anything you please in religion, was sacrificed to his pride, and that in France there was no law but "The king willeth it."

Nor will it suffice to say that eloquence was confined alone to the clergy; and, still more, that the remarkable men were Catholics, of which church Louis was himself a votary. Protestantism had its orators too. There were Jurieu and Bastide, both of whom had great learning and rare ability. John Claude was eminent for masterly eloquence and a man whom even Bossuet with all his insinuating charms could not overcome in debate. Peter du Bosy addressed the king in behalf of his oppressed brothers in the faith. Louis listened to him kindly, and when he had finished remarked: "That is the finest speaker in my kingdom." Other Protestant preachers in France were distinguished for their powers in the pulpit. There is this, however, to be said, pulpit eloquence differs from every other, in the gravity, dignity and importance of its subjects. These are ever the same—God, eternity, the reformation of the individual —and naturally more liberty would be allowed to those who discuss such themes than to orators of any other kind. Then, again, the preacher need not necessarily come in conflict with the reigning power.

In spite of what may be said, by way of explanation, history proves that eloquence is a plant which grows in all soils and conditions. Ireland has always had her orators. England and France and Germany have ever had theirs. Sparta and Athens, Italy, Hungary and the American colonies, had those who spoke divinely for their liberties. Even at the South, while slavery yet existed, there were most remarkable instances of this sort of genius among the negroes. America is called a nation of orators So that the only certain difference one is able to discover in favor of the free States, in the matter of eloquence, is numbers—quantity, but not quality.

Thus much it seems necessary to say introductory to a brief study of the most remarkable and greatest French preachers.

Louis Bourdaloue was born at Bourges in 1632. There are still in his native town a number of celebrated and ancient buildings. Of these is the cathedral of St. Etienne, as famous as

any in France; in the church of St. Pierre is the tomb of the wife of Louis XII.; the Hotel de Ville was once the private mansion of Jacques Cœur, and for various other reasons, this city occupies an interesting and important place in the history of the country.

Early in life, Bourdaloue joined himself to the Jesuits and was eminent in their college at Bourges, as a professor of rhetoric, philosophy and moral theology. He distinguished himself as a preacher, first, in the country churches, where he acquired so great a reputation that his superiors decided to send him to Paris. Thither he went in 1669, and at once became the favorite, in which high estimation he was held for twenty years. Louis XIV. often invited him to Versailles to preach.

Bourdaloue had remarkable force and energy of character. In the requirements of religion he was exacting and stern, and laxity of faith, or life, was sure to excite his opposition and call forth from him a severe rebuke. His hatred of Pascal, the author of the "Provincials," may be cited as an instance of the intolerance which belongs to a nature so rigid as was Bourdaloue's.

He had a high sense of the greatness and dignity of the ministerial office. The artistry of which mention has already been made, belongs also to this sacred calling; and if Louis XIV. was a king in every sense, Bourdaloue was in every sense a preacher. There was upon his part no catering to power, or such as were in authority. Convinced that he was sent upon a divine mission, he delivered his message accordingly. In the presentation of truth, he was unflinching and favored no man. He made no qualification or abatement even in favor of the *Grand Monarque.* The French court was extremely dissolute and corrupt. "Nothing is rarer," wrote one, "than Christian faith; there is no longer any vice here of which one is ashamed; and if the king were to punish all those who become guilty of the greatest vices, he would no longer have about him nobles, princes or servants; there would not be even a house in France which would not be in mourning." Besides, there was established, by Louis, a strict system of etiquette, consisting of the most absurd and ridiculous flattery. For instance: "The king

needs only to set a day for a review, or hunting party, and it never fails to be cloudless." The forms of civility were so troublesome, and the conversation so cumbrous with ceremony, that language was robbed of all beauty and sense. Well, when a preacher boldly rebukes such a court, or stands up and regardless of all rules of fashion, declares in such a presence the gospel without compromise, it is because he is both genuine in character and true to his grand trust. The king, however, had sense enough to see, and honesty enough to admit, that Bourdaloue was right. In reply to a licentious courtier who criticised the preacher for his severity, he said: "He has done his duty, now let us do ours."

As compared with the distinguished churchmen with whom Bourdaloue shared the ecclesiastical glory of his time, there is some difference of opinion. The French critics gave him the preference for solidity and careful, close reasoning. Boileau pronounced him a more perfect orator than Massillon. There are professional men also, who, after a thorough study of these clergymen, likewise decide in favor of Bourdaloue as to the entire arrangement and plan of his discourses. His enthusiastic admirers became more numerous in a short time than those of Bossuet. Sainte-Beuve remarks: "There is no doubt that if Bossuet had continued in the sermonizing career, which he followed from 1661 to 1669, he would not have kept the sceptre, and that Bourdaloue would have come in the general estimation only after and a little below him."

A brief view of the French pulpit will doubtless be helpful to a juster and more correct notion of Bourdaloue as a preacher. It is upon the side of a people's genius and character that they are influenced most. Hence it is very natural to suppose that this very thing affects both language and the orator. Such has ever been the case in France. The character of that people is impulsive and unstable. It was upon this fact that a French writer based his remark: "Everything happens in France." It turns out, therefore, that their preachers have beauty and imagination but lack coherence. They are warm and elevated, bold in figure, but wanting in strength. They aim at ornament rather than substance. An English writer on rhetoric and belles let-

tres makes a good presentation of the subject in a comparison of the French sermon with that of his own country. He says: "A French sermon is for most part a warm, animated exhortation; an English one is a piece of cool, instructive reasoning. The French preachers address themselves chiefly to the imagination and the passions; the English almost solely to the understanding. A French sermon would sound in our ears as a florid, and often, as an enthusiastic harangue. The censure which, in fact, the French critics pass on the English preachers is, that they are philosophers and logicians, but not orators. It is the union of these two kinds of composition, of the French earnestness and warmth, with the English accuracy and reason, that would form according to my idea the model of a perfect sermon." The style of Bourdaloue was somewhat after the ideal of this author. He wanted imagination and pathos, though he had great earnestness and piety. He had verbosity which was characteristic of the French orator, but he had depth and fervor and good sense and excellent reasoning. The theatrical manner of the pulpit, in his day, he reformed and made it more grave and simple and direct. His division on the words, "My peace I give unto you," has been greatly admired, and reveals something as to his methods. "Peace," he declares, "first to the understanding, by submission to faith; secondly, to the heart, by submission to the law." Bourdaloue's sermons were translated into many foreign languages.

The king was seized with the desire of bringing all his subjects over to the Catholic faith, and with that view sent Bourdaloue to Languedoc. That province, like Poitou and others, was infected with the "heresy," which had steadily been extending itself over Europe and was daily gaining more and more influence and strength. Its inhabitants were mainly laborers and artisans, but thoughtful, and when they had once tasted of the new wisdom would not easily be turned back to the old way. Louis did not profit by the experiences of his grand-father Henry IV., and of Richelieu, both of whom had made most strenuous efforts to accomplish the same end. The "powerful dialectician" did not meet with any signal success. The tide of a freer thought and of an individual sovereignty, in matters of

religion, had fully set in, and there was no power in the world, not even that of Louis XIV. could stay its progress.

The latter portion of his life Bourdaloue devoted to charity, visiting the sick and the prisons. He died May 13, 1704. Louis had in his service a man of abilities in war—Marshal Luxembourg. But while he was a good general, he was utterly without shame—"more corrupt than his age." His private life was such that it has almost obliterated his fame. His death, though, was distinguished like that of some others in his day, by devoutness and a pious turning to the Lord. Bourdaloue had said: "I haven't lived like M. de Luxembourg, but I should like to die like him." He died just as one might expect of so austere a man, "impressed with the miserable insufficiency of human efforts," and uttering these, his last words: "My God, I have wasted life, it is just that thou recall it."

## ARTICLE VI.

### THE EFFORT TO RECONSTRUCT HISTORY IN THE INTEREST OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL.

By M. VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

The necessity for this article is to be regretted. To write it gives no pleasure but the satisfaction of vindicating truth and justice. Notwithstanding Dr. Spaeth's address on the organization and work of the General Council, with its unfair and misleading statements concerning the General Synod, was taken up by the Philadelphia Pastoral Association and endorsed for wide and varied circulation, it was for a long time allowed to pass without any particular notice. Various reasons might be given for this. It was felt that the representations were too manifestly in conflict with the recorded facts to gain any extended credit as real history. In the strong desire, also, to cultivate peace between the different bodies of our unhappily divided Church, there was a disposition to bear the wrong in silence, if the silence should not be interpreted as a consent to the correctness of the offensive representations. It was hoped that the spirit of

forbearance might have exercise in the case without detriment to the truth of history. But during all this time frequent evidences were observable of a purpose, on the part of the adherents of the General Council, to accept the false account given in that address and to hold the General Synod in the dishonoring light in which it was meant to place it. The zeal of the Pastoral Association seems to have had this aim in view. The papers of the Council indulged in all sorts of ugly paragraphs about the assumed un-Lutheran character of the General Synod, interspersed with patronizing impertinences concerning theological improvement here and there discoverable, supposed to authorize hope of better things in the future. A great many bitter things have been printed which would never have been written were the writers as good as they ought to be or half as wise as they think themselves. It seemed to be thought that the General Synod was beginning to be conscious of its un-Lutheran position and getting ready to accept that of those who a few years ago adopted "The Fundamental Principles." The *Lutheran Observer's* recent reminder of many of the facts in the case, repelling some of the gratuitous aspersions of the address, has been made the occasion of multiplied outbursts of surprise and petty impatience, explicable only on the supposition that to the minds of those manifesting them, the Lutheran standing of the General Synod had been put beyond defense and that of the Council beyond criticism. And the last number of *The Lutheran Church Review* comes to us with a study of "the Causes leading to the organization of the General Council"—an article of no account whatever except as a sign of the working of the misleading influence—in which Dr. Spaeth's misrepresentations are assumed as historically established, and are confessedly made the writer's guide in discussing the subject. The necessity is thus forced on the friends of the General Synod to expose this attempted perversion of history and vindicate the truth against the misstatements sought to be substituted for the facts. Silence is no longer allowable.

The sum and substance of the representation by which Dr. Spaeth has sought the aim of his address, the focal point where he has endeavored to make all the rays of his account burn de-

structively against the General Synod, is the claim that the Synod of Pennsylvania withdrew from that body on account of its doctrinal position. To this all other allegations are made subordinate and tributary. The secession which was followed by the organization of the Council is alleged to have been the result of dissatisfaction with the General Synod's relations to the Confessions of the Church, and required by its persistent and growing un-Lutheranism. The whole series of preceding events is marshalled to point to a doctrinal necessity for the separation. "The long-continued and far-reaching conflict," it is declared, was one "in which the great principle of all true unity of Church and confession was at stake." "The attempt has been made repeatedly," says Dr. Spaeth, "on the part of the friends of the General Synod, to show that the breach at Fort Wayne took place not at all for the sake of the Confession, but simply on a point of order, and perhaps even as a result of personal feelings." He quotes Dr. Walther as correctly giving it the more imposing significance of a protest against the General Synod's departure from the true faith, and adds: "Any one willing to read the history of those days with an unprejudiced eye must come to the conclusion that the great battle was not fought for a mere technicality, but for a principle of the highest importance."

This gratuitous assumption is treated throughout as presenting the real fact in the case. From the coloring thus found the entire picture of the General Synod is drawn—a picture about as unlike the reality as misconception or prejudice could paint it. One bitter charge after another is thrust forward to intensify the exhibit of its perverse and aggravated unfaithfulness to the Lutheran name and doctrine and its invincible hostility to the Confessions. Upon it is thrown the entire blame of the necessary secession. All this is set in the portraiture over against finely drawn delineations of the Pennsylvania Synod's noble efforts and blessed influence in the interest of sound and consistent Lutheran teaching and practice, continued with great patience, till at last, as the only way to save true Lutheranism and secure a right development of the Church, the constantly deteriorating

and hopelessly un-Lutheran General Synod, like a misshapen and rotten ship, had to be abandoned.

It is not indeed surprising that in the calmer times which came after the "breach at Fort Wayne" and the consequent division of the Church, the actors in the divisive movement would wish for some worthier grounds for its justification in the eyes of Christendom and after generations than the asserted wrong of a parliamentary ruling which postponed the reception of the Pennsylvania Synod's delegates till after the General Synod's organization. It was no easy task to magnify that 'ruling,' with all that belonged to it, into an importance that could vindicate the extreme act of disrupting the general body in which Providence had largely united our Church for its earnest work in this country. The difficulty has been increasing year by year as time separates us further from the passions of that occasion, and the adherents of the General Council seem to feel a growing uncomfortableness in looking on that valiant withdrawal from the General Synod as brought about by a conflict on a parliamentary ruling, pivoted on a question of a Synod's right, involved in a point of order. It certainly would be more pleasant to think of it as a protest against departure from the true faith, an heroic faithfulness to the confessional basis of the Church, "a principle of the highest importance." This would put the Council's pedigree in a grander and more inspiring light. The inclination of its friends to take the suggestion and look at it in that light is altogether natural. And no person can justly find fault with all fair effort to exalt the body to which they belong. They are entitled to think as well of it as possible, to vindicate its position, and to set forth its merits and work in their best light. But whatever excuses for its existence they may find in the circumstances of its origin, or however they may admire its "fundamental principles" or rejoice in the mission they suppose it to be accomplishing, there is one thing which they are not entitled to do, and cannot be permitted to do without exposure of the misrepresentation and wrong—to credit, as the present attempt has been doing, the Pennsylvania Synod's separation, leading to the division of the Church in the formation of the Council, to dissatisfaction with the General

Synod's doctrinal basis or relation to our Church's Confessions, thus dishonoring this body by charging the disruption upon its un-Lutheran character.

To show the complete misrepresentation in this charge, it would be quite sufficient simply to quote the clear and repeated declarations of the Pennsylvania Synod itself. Dr. Spaeth, and those who are concurring with him in this attempted new version of the history of the case, are contradicted and confuted by the recorded testimony of the actors in the events; but to cover the whole misrepresentation it is best to recall some of the earlier facts.

1. To the General Synod is due the credit of inaugurating the recovery of our Church in this country to a proper acknowledgment of the Confessions of the Church. Dr. Spaeth's account of the general defection, in the earlier decades of this century, from the confessional recognition which marked the habits of the patriarchs of American Lutheranism, has unfortunately too much of truth in it. But the picture is much overdrawn. Only a narrow and bigoted exclusivism, which can see no Christianity outside of its circumscribing dogmatism, could speak of the religious life of our Church of that period as is done in that account. Despite that defection, the piety and earnest church life of the period were far superior to much that was seen in some places where the "pure doctrine" was gloried in. Yet the confessional standpoint of our Church was, at that time, to a great degree, most sadly abandoned or relaxed. And it is to be specially remembered—a fact which Dr. Spaeth treats with silence—that in few places was the defection more marked and general than in the Synod of Pennsylvania. Not only were its congregations so averse to being bound to any Church authority as to lead the Ministerium to abandon, in 1823, its place in the General Synod which it had helped to organize, but the clergy themselves were prevailingly of non-confessional mind. They steadily declined to bind themselves even to the Augsburg Confession. Dr. Jacobs, in "Lutheran Diet" 1877, tells us that the Tennessee Synod, which had formally bound itself to the Confession, "*sent for consecutive years to the Ministerium of Pennsylvania formidable documents, challenging its Lutheranism, which the*

*latter passed by in silence.*"* Dr. Spaeth should have put the picture of these repeated scenes in the Ministerium over against the scene he so graphically paints of Rev. Wyneken's failure of success on the floor of the General Synod in Philadelphia in 1845. The New York Ministerium, which withdrew from the General Synod after the first meeting in 1821 and returned only in 1837, was exceedingly lax on the question of distinctive Lutheranism and ready to break down all barriers between the English Lutheran and Episcopal Churches.† But this was quite equaled by the Synod of Pennsylvania in its formal proposal, in 1819, to unite with the German Reformed Church in the joint establishment of a common theological seminary for the two denominations, and its appointment of a committee, in 1822, under a resolution unanimously adopted, "to deliberate in the fear of God on the propriety of a proposition for a general union of our Church in this country with the Evangelical Reformed Church, and also on the possibility and most suitable method of carrying this resolution into effect."‡ It is pertinent to ask here, why Dr. Spaeth did not entertain his hearers and readers with these facts illustrating the Pennsylvania Ministerium's position, in connection with his pointing out the discreditable "attitude of the General Synod toward the Lutheran Confession," as indicated in the famous letter to the Evangelical Church in Germany in 1845: "In most of our Church principles we stand on common ground with the Union Church of Germany. The distinctive doctrines which separate the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches we do not consider essential." Was it because he thought that he could use the "attitude" of the General Synod against it more effectively by silence concerning the Ministerium's "attitude?" Or was he afraid of revealing the early and broad source of the trouble which still lingered in the General Synod in 1845? At best, is it fair that he should turn the characteristic confessional defection of the times all over on the devoted head of the General Synod, focusing it for the condemnation and dishonor of the very body that was not responsible

**Lutheran Diet*, 1877, p. 128. †*Lutheran Diet*, 1877, p, 127.

‡See Minutes of Pa. Synod, for 1819 and 1822.

for the laxness and had formally and actually begun the work of restoration?

For, from the very start in its work the General Synod inaugurated the order of recognizing the Augsburg Confession as the standard of doctrine. In 1825, when the Synod of Pennsylvania, which had then withdrawn from it, was silent about the Confession, even in the form of ordination, the General Synod resolved to establish a Theological Seminary, afterward carried into effect at Gettysburg, in which "shall be taught in the German and English languages, the fundamental doctrines of the sacred Scriptures, *as contained in the Augsburg Confession.*"* In 1826 the Seminary went into operation, and the professors' oath, after a declaration of *ex animo* reception of the Holy Scriptures, required him to say: "I believe the Augsburg Confession and the Catechisms of Luther to be a summary and just exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the word of God, * * and I solemnly promise not to teach any thing, which shall appear to me to contradict, or be in any degree more or less remotely inconsistent with the doctrines and principles avowed in this declaration." In the Constitution prepared by the General Synod, in 1829, for District Synods, the rule was adopted to ask, in ordination: "Do you believe that the fundamental doctrines of the word of God are taught in a manner substantially correct in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession."* In view of these facts, what is to be thought of Dr. Spaeth's declaring the early attitude of the General Synod to be that of "indifference to the Confession. It was ignored." Its attitude, as shown by facts, was positive and decided, and greatly in advance of the position of the Pennsylvania Synod. For at that time this Synod was using its Liturgy of 1818, which had no acknowledgment whatever of the Augsburg Confession in its form of ordination. Subsequently, in the Liturgy of 1842, published jointly by the Synods of Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio, it still declined to exact confessional obligation in ordaining to the ministry. In 1853, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania acknowledged "the collective body of the Symbolical Books as the historico-confessoinal

*Minutes of 1825, p. 5.

writings of the evangelical Lutheran Church." But this was a mere synodical resolution which obligated nobody, and merely enjoined it as a duty on ministers and candidates "to make themselves better and more thoroughly acquainted with these venerable documents of the fathers." It was not till 1855, two years after its reunion with the General Synod, that it introduced a pledge to the Confessions into its formula of ordination. Thus it took this Synod all these years to reach, in its synodical capacity and action, a confessional soundness with which the General Synod started in 1825.

In order to appreciate aright this leadership of the General Synod in introducing a return to the true confessional ground of our Church, it must be remembered that it was not organized for doctrinal aims, but for fellowship and coöperation in the great practical work before it in our land. It was carried on in addition to the main service to which its constitution consecrated its labors.

2. With this precedence at the outset, the movement in the General Synod was constantly toward a fuller conformity to the confessional faith of our Church. Most recklessly and in utter contradiction of the well-known facts, Dr. Spaeth affirms: "The development of the General Synod was in the opposite direction, further and further away from the good foundations of the fathers." Every one acquainted with the course of thought and feeling in our Church, knows how utterly baseless is this allegation. Perhaps some palliation of the author's offense in the assertion may be found in the fact that, at the period referred to, he had not yet come to our shores, and knew not whereof he affirmed. But such a plea would rather develop the incongruity of his undertaking to write out for us the 'true inwardness' of this history, and his presumption in asserting such a sweeping calumny out of his ignorance. That the growing tendency to confessional ground, working its way through varied and earnest controversy, revealed the dissentient position of many in clearer and stronger antithesis and intensity, was, of course, true, as this occurs in all cases of conflict between opposing views. But that the aggregate movement in the General Synod was toward, and not away from the "good foundation" of the faith as set

forth in the Augsburg Confession, has been conceded by symbolist and anti-symbolist. One need but look through the volumes of the EVANGELICAL REVIEW to see the trend of sentiment among us. Dr. S. S. Schmucker, whose relation to the Definite Platform, or Recension of the Augsburg Confession, would dispose him to discover the increasing defection, if there were any, from the *unaltered* Confession, declared in 1851: "Instead of retrogression, there has been an approximation to the Augsburg Confession in the General Synod, since her foundation. And the alleged recent growth of a more lax system among the members of the General Synod is a gross misrepresentation of the truth, as is well known to those who personally participated in the transactions of that body from the beginning."* This progress is included in the testimony of Dr. Krauth in 1864, just before the first withdrawal of the Pennsylvania Synod's delegation at York: "The General Synod was a declaration on the part of the Lutheran Church in America, that she had no intention of dying or moving—that she liked this western world and meant to live here. And she has lived and waxed stronger and stronger, and the general Synod has been a mighty agent in sustaining and extending her beneficent work, and is destined to see a future which shall eclipse all her glory in the past. Heaven pity the fate of the man who looks upon the General Synod as having been a curse to the Church or an inefficient worker in it—who imagines that Lutheranism would be stronger if the General Synod were weaker, or that truth would be reared upon the ruins of what she has been patiently laboring for nearly forty years to build."†

3. In 1864, just when Dr. Spaeth pretends that the Lutheran character of the body had become hopelessly deteriorated and lost, the General Synod placed itself on clearly unequivocal and full Lutheran basis, by an amendment of its Constitution, inserting an unqualified adoption of the Augsburg Confession, the catholic symbol of historic Lutheranism. If ever there had been a time when a lax or ambiguous mode of subscription

**Lutheran Church in America*, p. 203.

†*Lutheran and Missionary*, March 17, 1864.

to the Confession would have justified dissatisfaction on the part of earnest, true Lutherans or palliated the offense of separating and seeking more positive ground, that time was now gone forever. The General Synod had itself done the work of completing its right relation to the Confession. The Pennsylvania Ministerium, and others who acted with it, as will hereafter be shown, declared themselves fully satisfied. It is a simple fact, made indisputable by the records of the time, that this final step in the General Synod's confessional action, removed all desire to withdraw on account of its doctrinal position, or relation to the standards of the Church.

4. The repeated and solemn declarations of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania itself stand as an absolute and invincible refutation of Dr. Spaeth's great charge. It is, indeed, amazing that with the records of his own synod in his hands he could have undertaken the task of substituting a doctrinal or confessional reason in place of the real one for the "breach at Fort Wayne." The General Synod did not, in dislike of the Ministerium's confessional views, intentionally force the separation, using the expedient of a presidential ruling, nor did the delegation withdraw as a protest against confessional unsoundness. Never did a novelist, from a local or personal fact, weave out of his brain a more complete fiction, than the conclusion our author has framed out of the reported remarks of Dr. S. S. Schmucker in a conversation on the journey to Fort Wayne—making these remarks the accepted evidence that the ruling of Dr. Sprecher was the General Synod's "carefully concerted" expedient to force confessional Lutheranism out of itself. The proceedings of the body are themselves an ample refutation of the gratuitous allegation. Not only were the delegates of the Ministerium repeatedly asked to present their credentials, waiving what might seem to them an irregular organization, but the General Synod exhibited its joy on reaching such action as it expected would be acceptable to the delegation in an exultant singing of the doxology and joining in a prayer of glad thanksgiving. To admit Dr. Spaeth's explanation is to charge arrant hypocrisy on the whole assembled Synod.* The other claim,

*This idea, of an exclusion of the Pennsylvania Synod's delegates be-

that the "great battle" waged there was "not for a mere technicality, but for the sacred principle of confessional Lutheranism, is contradicted by the recorded declarations of the delegates and of the Synod itself. Dr. Spaeth and those who are concurring with him in his impossible version of the matter, are invited to look at these interesting records. They are found mostly in the Report of the Synod's Delegates to Fort Wayne, in an Appendix to the Minutes of 1866, and cover the point at issue in emphatic and reiterated declarations. We italicise the decisive statements.

*First*, in their account of the matter, they say of the convention of the General Synod at York in 1864, from which the first withdrawal of the Pennsylvania Synod's delegation had taken place on account of the reception of the Franckean Synod:

"After the withdrawal of your delegation, the General Synod, with great unanimity, recommended certain amendments to the District Synods, and also passed certain resolutions, which appeared to indicate an earnest desire, on the part of the remaining delegates of the convention at York, *to stand firmly and faithfully upon the true basis of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and of the General Synod*, and to prevent forever the reception of any Synod which could not and would not stand upon this basis."*

*Secondly*, the Synod of Pennsylvania in 1865 proceeded to elect delegates to represent it in the meeting of the General Synod to be held at Fort Wayne, thereby expressing its desire and purpose to remain in connection with it; and also adopted a statement of the reason of continuing the connection:

"In so doing the Synod desires it to be distinctly understood that * * it is moved to *maintain its relation to the General Synod from the conviction that by the action of the General Synod subsequent to the withdrawal of our delegation, in the adoption of*

---

cause of their Lutheranism—"rejected by a professedly Lutheran Synod for being Lutheran"—was ventured by the Synod's Committee which, in 1866, reported on the Report of the Delegates to Fort Wayne. See Minutes, Appendix, p. 22. But it is remarkable that the document on which the committee reported contains not one word of intimation of such an idea. It was, therefore, a contribution by the committee itself, derived, probably, from the same private conversation on the journey to Fort Wayne.

*Appendix, p. 2.

*the proposed amendments to the Constitution of the General Synod, the cause of the unity and the purity of our beloved Zion may be promoted.*"

Concerning the sentiment of the Synod in this election and explanation, the delegates in their Report in 1866 after their return from Fort Wayne, say:

"But they [the delegation that had withdrawn at York] and all their brethren of this body also felt and freely acknowledged at that meeting of Synod, *that the conservative course of the General Synod, after the withdrawal of the Pennsylvania Synod's delegation, removed all disposition to sever the connection of this body with the General Synod, and that it was the duty of the mother Synod that had made such earnest efforts to induce other Synods to unite with the General Synod in 1853, to retain its connection undisturbed, and to labor on in the General Synod, for the welfare of our beloved Evangelical Lutheran Zion in this land.*"*

Further on in their Report, giving the facts of the history, they repeat the declaration of their Synod's satisfaction with the General Synod's confessional position:

"When, therefore, the Synod of Pennsylvania met at Easton in 1865, and the time came for action on the proposed amendments and the election of delegates to the General Synod, the Synod, not for a moment doubting that it was at that time still in connection with the General Synod, *resolved formally and heartily to retain and continue that connection.*"†

The delegates further report that in their "Response" to the request to "waive what might *seem to them* an irregular organization," they declared to the General Synod itself:

"The course of the General Synod after the departure of the delegation of the Synod of Pennsylvania, in adopting the doctrinal amendments and other resolutions, *had removed all apprehensions that the Synod of Pennsylvania would resolve to sever its connection with the General Synod.*" * * "*That it had no thought of separating itself from this body at that time, but looked forward to the approach of the time for election of delegates to the General Synod as a matter of course.*" "The undersigned *declare positively* that at the meeting of the Synod of Pennsylvania in 1864 that body not only fully believed that it was still in the General Synod, but *had not the slightest idea of severing that connection.*"‡

---

*Appendix, p. 2. †Appendix, p. 3.
‡Appendix, p. 14.

They add that they interpreted to the General Synod the action of their Synod, in 1865, in connection with election of delegates.

"*The subsequent conservative churchly action of the General Synod inspired new confidence, and led the Synod of Pennsylvania to retain its old relation undisturbed*, hoping thus to promote the cause of the unity and the purity of our Church."

*Thirdly*, not only do the delegates in this Report, thus attest their own, and their Synod's, cordial satisfaction with the General Synod's confessional position, and declare that they stated this fact on the floor of the General Synod, but they distinctly and clearly give *another* reason for "the breach." They report how they made their remaining and working with the General Synod, according to their Synod's desire, turn upon the rights of their Synod as supposed to be infringed in Dr. Sprecher's parliamentary ruling. Their "Response" makes no less than nine points of complaint, but every one is simply an aspect of the "*unfair and unconstitutional treatment*" involved in that point of order. The ninth point presents the climax in this: "*That during the three days of discussion, the convention has declined to undo the wrong it has done, and to re-instate us in our proper position.*"*

In reference to the sympathy of some members of the General Synod with the Pennsylvania Synod in this "battle," the Report says:

"Your delegates suggested, that if the brethren desired to show their devotion to the right, they could do so by *uniting in a common protest against the unconstitutional proceedings of the so-called General Synod.*"†

It is worthy of note that all through the account, satisfaction with the constitution of the General Synod is implied in the representation that the wrong complained of and on account of which the delegates withdrew, came to pass only by a violation of that constitution.

The closing statements of the "Response" are most emphatic and conclusive. The decisive moment had come—in which the delegates were to present their ultimatum and state finally the

*Appendix, p. 17. †Appendix, p. 6.

pivotal interest about which their remaining or departing turned, and they declare:

"*We can say with a good conscience that we have not sought division, but have waited for union and are ready to co-operate in the General Synod*—provided:

*That this body shall now declare that the Synod of Pennsylvania had, as it claimed to have, the constitutional right to be represented before the election of officers and to take part in it, and might now justly claim the right of casting its vote.*

*If the convention will so declare, we are perfectly willing to waive the right of voting, will acquiesce in the present organization, and will take our seats in this body, equals among equals.*"

In view of this solemn declaration, what becomes of Dr. Spaeth's assertion concerning the General Synod's amendment of its constitution at York, unqualifiedly adopting the Augsburg Confession: "*But it came too late. The time had passed when disruption could have been prevented?*" Here the testimony is unequivocal, that it was not "too late" even two years later, when, at Fort Wayne, the delegates stood on the floor of the General Synod, declaring their readiness to remain and co-operate in it, taking their seats "equals among equals," on the sole condition of an acknowledgment of the Pennsylvania Synod's supposed constitutional rights as involved in the parliamentary question. Not one word is said in this final and decisive statement, as there had not been a single word or whisper before, about the un-Lutheranism of the General Synod as even *a* point in contention, to say nothing of *the* point in the "great battle." Dr. Spaeth's anxiety to have the disruption fixed beyond recall, has led him to antedate it by two whole years and to overlook the recorded reason of it when it did come. If ever there had been any confessional questions as irritants in the relation between the Synod of Pennsylvania and the General Synod, the evidence thus given shows that the confessional question was not at all the one on which the disruption took place.

*Fourthly*, after the reception of this report of the delegation to Fort Wayne, the action of the Pennsylvania itself, severing its connection with the General Synod, puts the question of synodical rights into the fore-front, and does not undertake to al-

lege the General Synod's confessional basis as the reason of separation. The resolution is:

"That as we have been unjustly deprived of our rights by the late convention of the delegates at Fort Wayne, and thereby excluded by them, and because of the conviction that the task of uniting the conflicting elements in the General Synod has become hopeless, and the purpose for which it was originally formed, has signally failed, we hereby declare our connection with the General Synod dissolved."*

Of the three items in this resolution, it will be observed, not one impeaches the General Synod's Lutheran basis. The first is the one great wrong that had been the monotone of complaint at Fort Wayne. Another is an asserted failure of the purpose for which the General Synod had been formed. When it is remembered that by concession of all—and of none more freely than of the Pennsylvania Synod—its original purpose was not at all doctrinal, but practical, it is seen at once that this item can have no reference to its confessional basis. The other—"that the task of uniting the conflicting elements in the General Synod has become hopeless"—does not charge the blame of this on the confessional basis. It *could* not do so, in face of the Pennsylvania Synod's own reiterated assertions of its being entirely satisfied with that basis, and its wish to remain and "cooperate" on it. The Pennsylvania Synod was itself one of the "elements," but the point of its conflict was made to consist in a question of synodical rights, and the 'hopelessness' came when it, in the passions of the hour, proceeded thus to disrupt the unity. So that even the action of that body in sundering the connection, fails to show any ground for Dr. Spaeth's representations.

*Fifthly*, No ground is found in the resolution by which the Pennsylvania Synod at the same time appointed the committee to issue the call for the convention which formed the General Council:

"To prepare and issue a fraternal address to all Evangelical Lutheran Synods, ministers and congregations in the United States and Canada, which confess the Unaltered Augsburg Con-

*Appendix to Minutes of Pennsylvania Synod, 1866, p. 23.

fession, inviting them to unite in a convention for the purpose of forming a union of Lutheran Synods."*

Even this resolution, it will be observed, does not impeach the genuineness and adequacy of the General Synod's basis. For, it directs a call to those who "*confess the Unaltered Augsburg Confession*"—nothing more. This is only what the General Synod had done, without qualification, and satisfactorily to the Synod that is now about to issue this call for a new body.

*Sixthly*, The Call *actually sent out* for the Reading Convention, indicated nothing more than the *Unaltered Augsburg Confession* as the basis of the proposed union. Even in parts of the Call which assailed the General Synod, no intimation was given of any need or intention of adding the binding authority of any other symbol than the "Unaltered Augsburg Confession, on which our Church rests as her unchangeable confessional basis."† The only allegation was that in the General Synod were men whose views and course were not in harmony with the Confession. That is, there were still various unassimilated elements in it. But did not the new body take into itself unassimilated elements? Does not Dr. Spaeth himself tell us of the exceeding caution with which the Council has had to deal with the conflicting views within it? What of the days of earnest and heated debate concerning what some affirm and others deny to be a "divine rule, derived from the word and confessions," as to pulpit and altar fellowship? It, however, ill becomes the members of the General Council, maintaining, as they do, against the still extremer demands of the Missourians, that its own position and principles are 'educational,' and should not be made 'coercive' or 'disciplinary,' to go back of the solemn official confession of the General Synod and the Synods in union with it, and deal with the question of the personal sincerity and consistency of all who belong to these Synods. But wholly apart from this question whether "fundamental principles" or their application should be ever left to act simply educationally, as the General Council has itself maintained, the fact is to be distinctly observed that naturally anxious as the Committee were, in call-

†Proceedings of the Reading Convention, pp. 3, 4.

*Appendix, p. 23.

ing the Reading Convention, to present broader and worthier grounds for the movement to destroy the General Synod than the asserted wrong at Fort Wayne, hitherto the burden of complaint, they did not assert that the confessional basis of the General Synod was not, *per se*, truly or adequately Lutheran, but contented themselves with parading overdrawn assertions of other things, most of which were practically *violations* of its basis and constitution, the responsibility for whose existence and occurrence, in fact, rested back in a state of things which their own Synod had a full share in bringing about. Even the call for the Reading Convention, let it be noted, sent out in the movement to break up, if possible, the General Synod, still recognized its truly Lutheran confessional basis by addressing its invitation, to form a "union of *Lutheran Synods*," to those who did just what the General Synod had already done—"confess the Unaltered Augsburg Confession." There is every reason to think, indeed, that the confessional extreme to which the Convention, six months later, went, in the organization of the General Council, was not publicly contemplated in the invitation, but came to pass under the brilliant and strong leadership of Dr. Krauth, whose Lutheranism was ever surpassing itself—a self-surpassing, however, that by perpetually annulling its own positions, forfeited for his interpretations of true Lutheranism the oracular character so often attributed to them.

The various facts thus put by the evidence beyond doubt are easily summed up. 1. That the General Synod inaugurated and took the lead in the process of restoring the Augsburg Confession to its true confessional authority among us. 2. That the movement in the General Synod was steadily into a better harmony with the Confession—Dr. Spaeth's assertion to the contrary being utterly confuted by the well known facts. 3. That two years before the disruption came at Fort Wayne, the General Synod, by the amendment to its constitution, fixed its confessional position so clear and positive as to fully satisfy the Synods which subsequently withdrew. 4. That the Synod of Pennsylvania itself in 1865 declared itself satisfied, that they elected delegates in evidence of this satisfaction, that its dele-

gates declared, in iterated forms, on the floor of the Synod at Fort Wayne, expressing the feeling of their Synod, in view of the "doctrinal amendments and other resolutions," the desire to "retain its old relation undisturbed" and that the Synod, had "not the slightest idea of severing the connection," that these delegates, in reporting back to their Synod, in 1866, their efforts to carry out the purpose of the Synod to remain in and co-operate with the General Synod, allege not one word placing the issue on the General Synod's confessional unsoundness, but positively and emphatically presenting it as having turned on the question of the Synod's "constitutional right to be represented before the election of officers," that neither the Pennsylvania Synod's resolution severing the connection, nor that appointing the committee to call the Reading Convention, nor the call itself as issued by the Committee, impeaches the adequacy of the General Synod's form of confessional obligation—all together constituting a full and complete disproof of Dr. Spaeth's unwarranted representations.

It is not the purpose of this article to discuss "The Fundamental Principles" adopted at Reading, or to institute any formal comparison between the confessional basis of the General Synod and that of the General Council. Its aim is accomplished in vindicating the truth of history against partisan attempts to distort it, and in recalling some of the unerasibly record facts which forever annul the pretence which offers the supposed un-Lutheran position of the General Synod as the necessitating or even justifying cause of the existence of the General Council. The facts given show that while there were intense and heated conflicts in the Church at the time, on both doctrinal and practical matters, it was just when the basis of union in the General Synod was made satisfactory and the Synod of Pennsylvania had "no thought" of leaving it, that the disruption came—came out of the debated claim of Synodical rights at Fort Wayne. The justifying reasons, if there are any, for the organization of the Council, must be found, if found all, in the state of things as existing only after the disruption—leaving the General Synod's confessional position free of the blame for the schism, as avouched by the recorded testimony of the seceding party itself.

But the circumstances which have necessitated this review of the case, call for a few words more. After the exhaustion of the passionate controversy which attended and followed that unhappy division of our Church, came a period of comparative quiet. A prolonging of the strife was felt to be unseemly and unprofitable. The pressing practical work of the Church summoned away from the contention. The last decade seemed to be one of enlarging church enterprise, and of growing good feeling between the separate general bodies. Congratulations over this improving state of things have been heard from many quarters—interspersed, however, with many uncharitable and unjust remarks, insulting and outraging the amenities which should hold among brethren. But in the comparative calm, the progress of thought and feeling has been into more vital harmony in the common faith and work of our Church. Good feeling and love have begun to flow across the dividing lines. From the General Synod—still true to its constitutional consecration, to 'apply all its powers toward the prevention of schisms, to be sedulously and incessantly regardful of the circumstances of the times and of every casual rise and progress of unity of sentiment among Christians in order that the blessed opportunities to promote concord and unity may not pass by neglected' —came a proposition to the other general bodies using the English language for the preparation of a "Common Service" in the interest of unity and uniformity—the General Synod taking the lead in the suggestion and adoption of this work. The harmonious preparations and unanimous adoption of this "Service" revealed to many how unjustly mistaken were the prejudices which they had been entertaining about the General Synod. Thus, various things have been strengthening hope of better harmony, if not indeed of unification, of our Church in the near future.

But there is reason to fear that these things have been misunderstood. The appearance in the *Lutheran Observer* of editorials criticising the extreme confessionalism of *The Fundamental Principles* of the Council and vindicating the General Synod against the aspersions of Dr. Spaeth's address—an address which broke the growing peace—was met by all sorts of

ill-natured expressions of surprise and disappointment, as though dissent from the Council's position or defense of that of the General Synod was alike no longer looked for. The truce in controversy and the General Synod's readiness to cultivate harmony, fellowship and co-operation, seem to have been mistaken for growing approval of the General Council. All this seems to make it necessary that it be set forth distinctly, so as to be understood once for all, that if the brethren of the Council have taken the sound Lutheranism which they have recognized in the General Synod, and this readiness for fellowship in worship and Church life, as any sign of a weakening of approval of the General Synod's confessional position or of any growing inclination to adopt that of the Council, it is best that the illusion should be at once and thoroughly dissipated. We are fully warranted in saying that it means nothing of the kind. The General Synod has incorporated in its fundamental law a clear and unqualified adoption of "the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that word," and there it proposes to stand. This Confession is the great historic, catholic, characterizing Confession of Lutheranism, the only one universally received as necessary to mark our Church, as every one knows who is acquainted in its history. The addition of the binding confessional authority of the Form of Concord and all the other symbols, in the mode of affirmation in the Council's Fundamental Principles, is a confessional extreme, derived from a movement in a post-reformation day, and marking, not the true catholicity of our Church, but a *particularity*, some places locally enforced, but never its true characteristic. History is full of the strife, discord, bitter conflicts, divisions, and loss to our Church, by the unwise attempts to enforce this 'particularity,' under the rigor of prescriptive confessional obligation. The General Synod, standing on the great Confession which represents the true catholicity, as well as the pure doctrine, of our Church, is firmly persuaded that that restrictive, exclusive, sectarianizing 'particularity' is not the type of Lutheranism which the patriarchs our American Church brought to this country, nor the kind for its true life, work, and success

in our land. If the members of the General Council like that inferior and smaller Lutheranism for themselves, it is their right to have it and to extol it, but the General Synod rightly insists upon the truer, broader Lutheranism of the unsectarianized Reformation period, a Lutheranism catholic enough to hold a Luther and a Melanchthon in unbroken fellowship and co-operation, a Lutheranism undiminished by the extremists who could accomplish their restrictive purposes with effect only after the steadying and restraining voice and power of Luther were removed by his death. There always have been those whose imperious dogmatism and intolerant confessionalism, at once most sweeping in scope and minute in rigidly fixing the extremest features of explanation, have tended to diminish or destroy the true catholicity of our great Lutheran Church, and there always have been those who have wisely withstood this tendency. To this greater, larger, richer, genuine Lutheranism of the Augustana, the Confession which, in its 'true and original sense,' stands at once for the catholicity of Christianity and of our Church, the General Synod is devoted; and it is cherished with undiminished loyalty by its members, not because of indifference to Lutheranism, but because of their love for it. This love for it forbids their consent to the astringing and contracting of their Church into the sectarian smallness and exclusiveness which "The Fundamental Principles" of the Council are declared to logically involve and necessitate—an intolerant exclusiveness inconsistent alike with the word of God and the true interpretation of the Confession. They mean—as the Pennsylvania Synod so well put the import of the York amendment—"to stand firmly and faithfully upon the true basis of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and of the General Synod," being thoroughly persuaded that this is the genuine Lutheranism to which belongs the future of our Church in this land.

As the members of the General Synod have not found in the Council a better confessional basis, so they have failed to discover in it a more efficient agency for uniting the scattered tribes of our Church. The hope of union on the basis of this narrow 'particularity,' instead of the true catholicity, of Lutheranism, has not been made inspiring by the General Council's

experience. Dr. Spaeth, indeed, says that "there has never been a serious attempt to controvert the soundness of the doctrinal basis of the General Council." The Dr.'s reading and memory have not served him well in this matter. Does he not know of Dr. Brown's searching analysis of the "Fundamental Principles," showing their absurd logical consequences and their inconsistency with the true Lutheran conception of the place of church confessions? But altogether apart from the question of "serious attempt to controvert the basis" of the union sought to be effected by the Council, has not Dr. Spaeth himself recorded the fact that "Missouri kept aloof from the whole movement?" And he is fully aware that Missouri does not look upon the basis as sufficient, in itself, to insure the full practical application of the Lutheran doctrines. Has he not himself told us also of the Joint Synod of Ohio's declining to come in without further guarantees as to Chiliasm, mixed communion, exchange of pulpits, and unchurchly societies? Has he not mentioned, too, the anomalous attitude of the Synod of Iowa, which the papers have lately informed us is still not ready to come in? Is not the Norwegian-Danish Augustana Synod in like attitude? Have not the Wisconsin Synod, the Synod of Minnesota, and the Synod of Illinois withdrawn? And has not the principle of refusing fellowship and co-operation except on absolute agreement in dogmatic confessionalism and identity of confessional interpretation, lately rent the union of the General Conference, on the question of predestination? The prospect of a union of our Church on this principle has not grown bright. If any thing else has been needed to confirm the devotion of General Synod men to its own catholic basis, it has been furnished by Dr. Jacob's recent long and labored defense of the "Fundamental Principles" in *The Lutheran*—a defense that has its only plausibility in assumptions of the legitimacy and necessity of the intensest sectarian, close-communion, intolerant denominationalism. In the last issue of that paper* he sums up their import in what is substantially a claim, in the face of the whole history of dogmatic and confessional development, that the Church's confession of God's truth is to be held, like the word of God itself, as

*Sept. 23, 1886.

"unchangeable." His confidence in the Council's mode of binding to the whole Book of Concord is so great that he confidently predicts the General Synod's early adoption of the Council's basis. We believe this prediction has come out of his own abundant admiration for the "Fundamental Principles" and confidence in the force of his own logic in their defense, rather than from anything he knows of the purposes of the General Synod.

The growth of fellowship with the brethren of the General Council, and the readiness to co-operate with them in the adoption of a common order of service and in Church activity, must, therefore, not be misunderstood. The General Synod stands in no exclusive or intolerant attitude. Its catholic Lutheranism puts it in just fellowship with all parts of our Church holding the unaltered Augsburg Confession. The co-operation in preparing the Common Service required no consent to the Council's extreme confessionalism, and none has been given. It called for no abandonment of the General Synod's basis. The coöperation took place in full harmony with its catholic Lutheran organization and spirit. It is to be hoped that even the continued unfair and unjust representations of its character, such as that which has called forth this paper, will not be allowed to abate among us this characteristic readiness and effort to promote fellowship and unity in our unhappily divided Church.

## ARTICLE VII.

### THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

By Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D., Springfield, O.

The words of the Creed, by which the Church confesses her faith in the Communion of Saints, are of late introduction. Augustine, who wrote a special treatise on Faith and the Creed knows nothing of these words. Prof. Lumby, of Cambridge, gives the date of their use by Eusebius Gallus as 550 (?). Prof. Heurtley holds that they did not find place in the Creed until near the close of the eighth century, since they are not found

in the Creed of Etherius, 785.* Westcott says: "Our Western forefathers added, as late perhaps as the eighth century, a fresh clause to the Creed in order to give clear expression to the characteristic thought, and taught us to declare our belief in *the Communion of Saints.*"—*Historic Faith*, p. 123.

The doctrine of the Communion of Saints dwelt in the consciousness of the Church from the very beginning. It is exemplified at Acts 2 : 44, 45, and is taught in those passages which speak of "fellowship" (*κοινωνία*), as "the right hand of fellowship," fellowship of the mystery," "fellowship in the Gospel," "fellowship with one another;" "partakers (*κοινωνόι*) of the altar," "partakers of glory," "partakers of the divine nature;" also, "Ye are all one man in Christ." "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all."

Under the persecutions and trials which the Church endured in the earlier centuries of her history, this doctrine must have afforded strong consolation to the saints, viz.: that they had fellowship with each other, and were common partakers of the blessings of redemption. This doctrine, so precious and so full of comfort and inspiration, the saints, it is natural to conclude, would seek to embody in some brief and comprehensive formula which could take its place in the Creed alongside of "Remission of Sins," "Life everlasting," &c. But what the particular circumstances were which led to this addition to the Creed cannot now be ascertained. Usually creeds are prepared or enlarged for the purpose of meeting prevalent or encroaching heresy, and for the purpose of stating what is the faith of the Church at that

*"This clause which does not occur in any of the formularies of the Eastern Church, was one of the latest additions to the Western Creed. St. Augustine was ignorant of it, for he says in his Enchiridion: 'Post commemorationem Sanctae Ecclesiae, in ordine Confessionis, ponitur Remissio Peccatorum.' C. LXIV; and in Serm. C. CXIII, 'Cum dixerimus 'Sanctam Ecclesiam,' adjungimus 'Remissionem peccatorum.'"

"We first meet with the clause in one of the Creeds expounded by Eusebius Gallus, (XXX).

After a longer interval it occurs again in one of the Creeds of the Codex Bobiensis, XXVIII. It is still wanting in the Creed of Etherius, A. D. 785 XX–XII. It can hardly therefore be considered as established before the close of the eighth century." Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 145.

time. In accordance with this idea Lord King in his Critical History of the Creed, supposes that the words, *Communio Sanctorum*, were added in order to meet the Donatistic heresy, and that in so far they signify principally two things: "First, that a sign whereby one knows a true church is, that other churches communicate with it. Secondly, hence also a negative sign, whereby any church which sets up an exclusive claim like the Donatists, thereby unchurches itself." This opinion is accepted by J. G. Walch, *Introd. in Lib. Sym.*, p. 99; also by Wilson in *Bampton Lectures* for 1851, p. 7. One sufficient reason for rejecting this opinion is, that it requires us to assume the introduction of these words into the Creed from one to three centuries earlier than the date now fixed by the most trustworthy scholarship, since Donatism rapidly declined after the first quarter of the fifth century, and ceased to have any considerable influence by the beginning of the sixth century.

Some have thought that the words in question came into the Creed through the catechetical exposition-praxis, as explaining the meaning of *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica.* This opinion lacks historical confirmation.

Failing therefore to ascertain the exact time and the circumstances which introduced these words into the Creed, a more important question is, What do they mean? Lord King thinks that on the whole they were added to declare that true churches ought to have communion and fellowship with each other. Wilson, *Bampton Lectures*, 1851, p. 14, says, "When the clause is first found, although not in an authorized and public way, it is expounded, not in reference to the general community of interests which belong to Christian people, but in regard to supposed particular relations between the living saints and the dead. It may be true, that, to use the words of Bishop Pearson, 'they which first found this part of the article in the Creed, and delivered their exposition unto us, have made no greater enlargement of this communion as to the saints in heaven, than the society of hope, esteem and imitation, on the one side, of desires and supplications on their side.' But as other opinions grew up, they clustered round and appropriated a term which did not

originally belong to those subjects, which belonged originally to the department of discipline rather than to that of theology."*

Luther, *Large Catechism*, Art. III., OF THE CREED, says: "The holy Christian Church the Creed denominates a communion of saints (*communionem sanctorum*), for both expressions are taken together as one idea. * * Also the word *communion*, which is added, ought not to be communion (*Gemeinschaft*),† but congregation (Gemeine). And it is nothing else than an interpretation whereby some one meant to explain what the Christian Church is."‡

Here arise three questions: First, was this addition made to the Creed in order to explain what the Christian Church is? Let it suffice to say that neither King, nor Pearson, nor Heurtley,§ nor Wilson, nor Lumby, has made any such discovery.

---

*"The following are the chief meanings and employments of the word communion. Temporal and spiritual communion; ecclesiastical and lay; communion of fraternity, as between bishops; communion of his people, when a bishop held no communion with other bishops, 'contentus sit communione plebis suae;' ordinary communion; foreign communion, in two senses: 1. of strangers or visitors; 2. a depression of ecclesiastics to lay-communion so-called; communion of sacraments; communion of the altar; communion with oblations or without oblations, referring to different stages of penitents; communion by oblation of name; communion by salutation or benediction; communion by letters; communion by commemoration as in the 'communicantes;' communion of saints between the living and the dead; between the Church militant and the Church triumphant."—Wilson, *ut supra*.

†In the *Agende* of the Pennsylvania Synod, 1786, *Gemeinschaft* is used, and not *Gemeine*. Also in the Darmstadt Catechism, 1783. Also in Henkel's Catechism (New Market) 1811.

‡Book of Concord (Jacobs), pp. 444–5. See German and Latin.

§"Different views have been taken of the meaning of the clause. It is important to notice that the earliest commentators, that one in the number in whose sermons we first meet with it, understood it especially of the communion which the saints on earth have with the saints departed. '*Sanctorum Communionem:* Sed sanctos non tam pro Dei parte quam pro Dei honore veneramur. Non sunt sancti pars Illius, sed Ille probatur pars esse sanctorum. * * Colamus in sanctis timorem et amorem Dei, non divinitatem Dei. Colamus merita, non quae de proprio habent, sed quae accipere pro devotione meruerunt. Digne itaque venerandi sunt, dum Dei nobis cultum et futurae vitae desiderium contemptu mortis insinuant.'—Eusebius Gallus, Hom. 2.

No one of these original investigators mentions this as the reason for the introduction of this clause into the Creed. We are compelled therefore, on the authority of the highest historical and theological scholarship, to surrender this opinion of Luther, as long ago we were compelled to surrender the judgment of all the reformers in regard to the true apostolic authorship of the Creed, and that of the dogmaticians on the inspiration of the Hebrew vowel-points.

---

'Sanctorum communionem: id est cum illis sanctis qui in hac quam suscepimus fide defuncti sunt societate et spei communione teneamur.'—Serm. CC—XLII., alias De Tempore, C XXXI., among the sermons falsely ascribed to St. Augustine. Opera. Tom. V."—Heurtley *Harm.* Sym., p. 146.

The oldest explanation wich I have been able to find dates from Nicetas (454–485) who says: Ecclesia, quid aliud quam sanctorum omnium congregatio? Ab exordio enim sancti— Justi— una ecclesia sunt, quia una fide et conversatione sanctificati.—Ergo in hac una sancta ecclesia crede te communionem consecuturum sanctorum. See Herzog, *Real-Encyc.* From this it is very evident that *communio sanctorum* is not equivalent to *una ecclesia*, but is a good found in the one Church, as explained by Nicetas in his Exposition of the Faith.

According to Caspari, Faustus of Gaul in the fifth century gives the following explanation: Ut transeamus ad sanctorum communionem. Illos hic sententia ista confundit, qui sanctorum et amicorum Dei cineres non in honore debere esse blasphemant, qui beatorum martyrum gloriosam memoriam sacrorum reverentia monumentorum colendam esse non credunt. Thus Nicetas and Faustus living before the words became fixed in the Creed may be regarded as authentic interpreters. That is, the idea given by these and other ancient interpreters, so far as we can discover, is uniformly that of *communion between the real saints*, and not that of didactic equivalence to Holy Catholic Church. In mediæval times this doctrine of real communion between the saints was limited mainly, perhaps wholly, to that between saints on earth and the saints in heaven. Bellarmin says: "Communio sanctorum, extra hanc vitam invocandorum." Against this now one-sided, exaggerated, vulgarized, idolatrous idea, the Reformation was such a protest as really depressed for awhile the proper idea of communion to a degree that almost took away the basis of the article; and hence it was treated as by Luther, Gerhard, and others, as epexegetical of the preceding article. We are now returning to the original, fundamental meaning of the article, without its earlier limitation and subsequent idolatry; that is, we are confessing a communion of all the saints, but we do not invoke the saints.

Are the terms, Holy Christian* (catholic) Church and Communion of Saints, the perfect equivalents of each other, so that they both comprehend one and the same thing, as the German expresses it? This is the second question.

Luther was doubtless led to this view by his doctrine of the Church in opposition to Rome, which maintained that the Church was an external polity or visible organization, and that visibility and externality are its chief characteristics.† At Leipsic in 1519 Luther declared, "There is one holy universal Church, which is the whole body of the predestinated." Subsequently to this he called the Church simply the *Communion of Saints.* He maintained that wherever the Gospel is preached and the sacraments are administered, there true believers will appear. These alone are the proper members of Christ and have communion with the Holy Ghost and are partakers of all the blessings of Christianity. Therefore the Church is a community, an assemblage, a company of saints, that is, a congre-

*Luther preferred "Christian" to "Catholic," but was not the first to suggest this change. Says John Ebart: "By the word *Christliche* is meant *Catholische*, because the name Christian is spread through the whole world." The Lutheran theologians have not generally followed Luther, but prefer *Catholic.* In this article we use *Catholic.*

†Bellarmin describes the Church as an "assemblage of men bound together by the profession of the same Christian faith and the communion of the same sacraments, under the government of lawful pastors and especially of the Roman pontiff the sole vicar of Christ on earth." He adds: "The Church is as visible and as manifest to the senses as the assemblage of the Roman people, the kingdom of France, or the republic of Venice." Luthardt says, *Dogmatik*, p. 19: "Das Wesen des Romanism. ist die Identificirung des Christenthums mit der äusserlichen, hierarchisch gegliederten, im Primat des röm. Bischofs gipfelnden Kirche, deren Organismus der inspirirte and irrthumslose Trager und Garant der Wahrheit, welchem unterthan zu sein daher die vordeste Pflicht des Christen ist. Die Kirche ist daher nothwendig eine respublica visibilis et palpalilis, die Stellvertreterin Christi des Proph., Hohenpr. und König's, die Forts. seiner Incarnatio, die Mittlerin des Heils. Sie zerfällt in eccl. docens et audiens, imperans et obediens. Ihr Wesen ist gesetslicher, nicht evangelischer Art. Sie ist dem einzelnen gegenüber die höchste richterliche und heilsmitter. Autherität; der Gehorsam gegen sie so unbedingt, dass es eine Berechtigung der in der Schrift ruhenden Glaubensgewissheit und des Christlichen Gewissens ihr gegenüher schlechterdings nicht gibt."

gation of those who have imputed to them the righteousness of Christ, and are ruled by the Holy Ghost. Luther never would allow any other definition* of the Church, and insisted solely on true faith and the attribute of invisibility.† But is this (*communio sanctorum*) an adequate definition of the historic Holy Catholic Church, that is, does it comprehend *inter terminos* all that the Church herself has comprehended under the words *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, so as fairly to exhaust the idea which these words are intended to convey, and so as to justify me in writing and saying the Creed as follows: "I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins," etc.?

Now why do I say *Credo Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam?* I believe the Church is *Sancta* notwithstanding the sins and shortcomings and positive crimes of many of her members. I believe it because her Head is holy, the Holy Ghost is active in her, her doctrines and institutions are holy, her end is holy, many of her members are holy. These possessions and qualities of the Church cannot be tested by the senses. They are the objects of faith. But they impart a holy character to the Church; an aggregated holiness, such as belonged to the company of the Apostles, of whom Christ said, "Now ye are clean, but not all;" there was Judas who was a devil,—such holiness as belonged to the twelve tribes of Israel, although Korah and his company are among them: "All the congregations are holy together, and the Lord is among them." Why do I believe the Church is *Catholica?* I believe it not mainly because she is

*See Smalcald Art. XII. Also Schwabach Art. XII: "This Church is nothing else but believers in Christ, who with true faith maintain and profess the fore-mentioned articles, and moreover in the world suffer persecution and martyrdom."

†Polycarp Lyser asks the question, "Did Luther define the Church as invisible?" "In discussing that subject [the Church] Luther spoke only of the true and living members of the Church. * * He opposed that propositon to the papal Church which seeks to shine only in external splendor, and maintains that the Church is so bound to this external visible assemblage that he who does not submit to them (pope, cardinals, etc.) cuts himself off from the church. This Luther denied."—*Catechismus Lutheri Latino-Germanicus.*

locally extended *in toto mundo*, and embraces all true believers; but mainly because she has preserved the whole fulness of the divine truth, through which she will ultimately prevail over the entire earth.*

But what as regards *Ecclesia?* *Ecclesia* is not *per se* properly an object of faith. She is an empirical society, a manifest *politia* with rites, ceremonies, laws and institutions,—a veritable reality, a great fact potent to the senses. And so distinctly is this attribute of externality, of empirical quality, impressed upon the Church, that it may be safely said that no definition of the Church is adequate which does not recognize and give due emphasis to this feature.

(a). Such a recognition is required in order to make our idea of the Church agree with the inspired description given by Luke in Acts 2 : 42, "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers"—which shows us the *de facto* Church of Jesus Christ, which consists in the maintenance of apostolic doctrine, in organization, in the use of the sacraments, in public worship. (b). The same recognition of empirical quality is required by the facts of history. The Church in some sense precedes faith as well as requires faith. "The remission of sins" as to substance is a doctrine of the divine word, but "I believe the remission of sins" as to form, is a doctrine of the Church, and it was not until the pious priest, a visible servant of the visible Church, preached this doctrine to Luther that he found peace for his distressed soul. And it is in harmony with the same idea that the Augsburg Confession says, Art. V: "For the obtaining of this faith, the ministry of teaching the Gospel, and administering the sacraments, was instituted," etc., that is, appeal is made to the visible Church.†

(c). The same recognition of external quality is required in order properly to meet fanatics and to avoid at least the *appearance* of Donatism. Hence Luthardt, *Dogmatic*, p. 297, *Edi. septima*, says: "Melanchthon in the Loci of 1535 and in the

*See Spener's *Tabulae Cat.* Also Wescott's *The Historic Faith*, p. 122.

†It bears on this point that many of the dogmaticians place *De Ministerio Ecclesiasto* before *De Ecclesia*.

improved of 1543, in opposition to the Donatistic and fanatical errors of the Anabaptists, emphasizes more the empirical Church as the necessary place for the essential Church, and defines it therefore, not as *Communio Sanctorum*, but as *Coetus Vocatorum:* 'Whensoever we think of the Church let us look upon the assemblage of the called (coetum vocatorum) which is the visible Church, and let us not dream that there are any elect except in this visible assemblage'—'The visible Church is the assemblage of those who embrace the Gospel of Christ and rightly use the sacraments, in which God operates by the ministry of the word, and regenerates many to eternal life.' Likewise Chemnitz* also emphasizes the empirical Church: 'It must be known to us. Wherefore it is defined as the visible assembly of those who embrace the Gospel of Christ, &c.' "†

Polycarp Lyser, in answer to the question, "What is the Church?" says: "Usually it is thus defined: The Church is the visible assemblage of those who embrace the Gospel of Christ, and rightly use the sacraments, in which (*coetu*) God operates by the

---

*"It is most certain that the true Church cannot be separated from true doctrine, or the faith. For that is the true Church which embraces and professes the true and sound doctrine of God's word."—*Exam. Trid.*, Ed. Preuss., p. 49.

†See Melanchthon's numerous definitions of the Church in his *Corpus Doctrinae*, Lipsiae, 1563. Especially his answer to the question, Quid sit ecclesia sancta? p. 897, also to An sit Visibilis Ecclesia? p. 899. In the Apology, Chap. IV., he says: "The communion of saints *seems* to be added in order to explain what the Church signifies." I cannot find that he subsequently so employed *communio sanctorum*. See Chemnitz, *Loci, De Ecclesia*, Cap. III: "God wishes us to seek, to know and to understand what and where the true Church is, that we may become members of it and hear it. For it is as a city set upon a hill, as a candle not hid under a bushel, but placed on a candlestick, Matt. 5 : 15. Therefore it must be known not only to God who understands secret things, and looks into hearts, but also to us." Compare definitions of the Church in the *Confessio Wirtebergensis*; also the *Confessio Saxonica*. The latter quotes the Creed: Credo esse Ecclesiam sanctam Catholicam, and says: "We point out a Church that can be seen and heard." "The Church is a coetus which can be seen and heard." Also Vogel under the head, Quid et Quae sit Vera, sancta, et Catholica Ecclesia: "The Church is the coetus of persons embracing the pure word, etc." "This coetus is called the Church catholic."—*Thesaurus Theologicus.*

ministry of the word, and regenerates many unto eternal life. In this assemblage, however, there are many unholy, but they agree in regard to true doctrine."—*Catechismus Lutheri*, p. 83.

It will thus appear how these great theologians of the Church, in the face of error, were forced to bring out and emphasize the empirical quality of the Church. They plainly saw that Luther's definition, a community of saints, emphasized only one side of the idea of the Church, since even the saints themselves are visible persons, and since the entire *coetus vocatorum* taken together has Christianity for its *norm.** And it was to preserve this empirical quality of the Church that Melanchthon invented *Ecclesia large dicta*, which in one form or another is very generally used by the dogmaticians. It is also in the same line of argument that König says, after giving the definition of the Church to be quoted hereafter: "The attributes and adjuncts of the Church are unity, sanctity, catholicity, apostolicity, authority, visibility, splendor, affliction, defectibility." The attributes and adjuncts of what Church? Evidently the *Ecclesia visibilis*, the *coetus vocatorum*, outside of which we are not to look for either *sanctitas* or *catholismus*. This, it can easily be shown, is the idea which the witnessing confessing Church herself has always understood by *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*—the *coetus visibilis*, whose *sanctitas* and *catholismus* are believed, for reasons given on a previous page.†

Hence it is only when the dogmaticians define the *invisible* Church that they call it an assemblage or congregation of saints. Thus Hollazius: *Ecclesia stricte, proprie et exquisite dicta est coetus vere credentium et sanctorum*, which is by no means com-

*"The Church as a society asserts unfalteringly the claims of the Gospel though the message may often be the condemnation of those who bear it. The ideal is firmly held forth through all disasters. And this maintenance of a great faith is a power of life. * * The Christian Church, wearied and betrayed by men, does not despair of humanity. By that spirit she vindicates her life. She offers to all without reserve and without doubt the calling to holiness and the assurance that the call can be obeyed."—Westcott, *The Historic Faith*, p. 119, 120.

†This same Church which Chemnitz calls "the true Church," now visible, contains those essential features which shall triumph and abide forever. This we *believe*.

mensurate, either historically, confessionally or didactically, with the faith of the Church in *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica;* for this *Ecclesia invisibilis*, composed of true believers and of persons ruled by the Holy Spirit, is found nowhere (*see Melanchthon supra*) except in the visible *coetus*,* which has the word and the sacraments, without which she could not be the *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, for losing these, she would cease to have the notes of the Church, and would cease to have those sole means of grace by which men become true members of the body of Christ. Hence while the definition, the Church is *coetus vere credentium et sanctorum*, is undoubtedly correct in so far as the *invisible* Church, the truly saved, the living members of the body of Christ, are concerned, that is not what is historically and confessionally meant by *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, which has always included and always will include (in the Church militant) the idea of the visible *coetus* outside of which even we Protestants teach that there is ordinarily no forgiveness of sin and no sanctification.—*Book of Concord* (Jacobs), p. 446.

And now should the opinion of Luther be allowed that *communio* means *congregation* (*Gemeine*), the phrase, *Communion of Saints*, could correspond only to the *invisible* part of the Church, that part which has true communion (κοινωνία) with Jesus Christ, and is partaker of the Holy Ghost.

In harmony with the foregoing exposition, may be quoted authorized and standard definitions of the Church. In the seventh article of the Confession, we have: "The Church is the congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments rightly administered." This definition Melanchthon triumphantly defended in the Apology as applying to the essential or *invisible* Church; but he appeals to the eighth article to show that the confessors also maintain a *visible*

*Polycarp Lyser, after defining the Church as quoted on a preceding page, "*Ecclesia est coetus visibilis, etc.*," says: "Quicumque in illo coetu sunt ab impiis segregati et tam imputatione justitiae Christi, quam spiritus inchoatione sanctificati, illis omnia spiritualia Christi beneficia sunt communia."

Church.† The dogmaticians generally follow the definition of the Confession, and define the Church primarily with reference to the *invisible* features, but they always qualify the definition or expand it so as to include the *visible* Church. For instance König: "Ecclesia Synthetica vel stricte sumitur, pro coetu sanctorum; vel latius and γενικῶς pro coetu vocatorum promiscuo."

---

†"In the *seventh* article the pious confessors declare that the one holy Church shall abide forever, or that the Church is the congregation of saints. But when they add that in this Church which is the congregation of saints, the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered, the impression is at once made, that the invisible Church which will abide forever, since it is the congregation of saints, is joined with (confundatur) the visible Church, which also is the true Church, a characteristic of which is that in it the word of God is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered. Wherefore Valentinus Alberti in *Augustana Confessione*, etc., Cap. X., p. 302, observes that in this article the Confession speaks of the Church in so far as it signifies Coetum fidelium, but in such a way that it must be regarded in a double sense: First, as regards essence, in which sense the one holy Church shall abide forever; but in this sense it exists invisible. Secondly, as regards the principal adjuncts, namely, true doctrine and public worship, in which sense it is visible, but will not abide forever. Interpreters have resorted to different methods of reconciling these words of the Confession. Besides others we mentions Jo. Trid. Walliserus. It is self-evident that the Confessors speak principally of the invisible Church, as is shown by what they have said in the Apology. But at the same time they considered this invisible Church in so far as it is visible, though not wholly so, since it is scattered through the whole world, yet at least a certain part is visible. But that they may indicate a mark of the true visible Church, they add, that in it the divine word is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered. They seem to have joined the two ideas for the purpose of satisfying the objection of the papists and of refuting the error of others. * * Others think that our forefathers opposed themselves to the Romanists because they (the Romanists) would admit only the external Church, in order that with the better grace they might apply to the Romish Church the praises and promises which belong only to the invisible Church. Although indeed the difference between the invisible and the visible Church must not be understood as though there are two kinds of Church, one of which is visible, the other invisible; but there is only the one and that the true Church, which from different points of view may be called both visible and invisible. The confessors wished to indicate a note or mark by which it could be known, whether a certain Church, if it be considered as visible, be true and pure." *Walch's Introduc.*, p. 279, et seq.

But his final definition of the Church, is: "*The Synthetic Church is the mixed assemblage of persons called by the ministry of the word to the kingdom of God and to the participation of spiritual and heavenly blessings, and agreeing in the outward profession of the true doctrine.*"*

John Ebart, in his *Enchiridion Theologicum*, honored with a preface by Dr. Christian Chemnitz, says, p. 475, "We do not deny that the true Church is visible; but we do not concede that it is purely and *per omnia* visible." Quenstedt, *De Ecclesia*, Sec. I., V, says: "The Synthetic Church is taken, I., broadly and generically for the common assemblage of all the called, who use the preaching of the word and the sacraments; II., strictly and specifically for the assemblage of the saints or of believers embraced in the general congregation." Such definitions of the Church are a fair sample of those given generally by the dogmaticians, not one of whom has ever ventured to give so broad a definition of *Communio Sanctorum*, which, upon the assumption of Luther that Holy Catholic Church and *Communio Sanctorum* are the exact equivalents of each other, they would be justified in doing, according to the axiom that things which are equal to each other are each equal to the same thing. On the contrary in all the definitions given by the dogmaticians (examined by us) *Communio Sanctorum* is less *extensive* than *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, and is confined wholly to participation in the blessings of redemption. Moreover, they use the word *Sanctorum* as pertaining *wholly* to those who are truly sanctified, that is, have the righteousness of Christ imputed to them and are ruled by the Holy Ghost; whereas no such *exclusive* sense attaches to *Sancta* as applied to *Ecclesia*.†

---

* *Theologia Positiva*, p. 278. See same definition in Quenstedt, *De Eccl.*, Sec. I., XXI.

†According to Rufinus the ancients interpreted the holiness which the Creed imputes to the Church, of purity and holiness of doctrine. Dixon and Smith in Church Catechism (Episcopal) make a clear distinction between "the true saints" and "the Church of Christ [which] is a collection of *holy persons, or saints.*"—p. 103. *Sancta* belongs to the Church in the broader sense; *Sanctorum* is used of the higher saintship. See Robinson, sub. ἅγιος, Pearson, Spener *Tab. Cat.*, p. 101, also the dogmaticians in their explanations of *Communio Sanctorum*. *Sanctorum* is uniformly made

In an appendix to the Book of Concord published at Leipzig, 1677, we have an exposition of the Creed. *Communio Sanctorum* is treated apart from *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, as follows: SANCTORUM, sanctitate tum imputata, qua meritum Christi nobis imputatur, tum inchoata qua subinde crescunt motus spirituales, notitia, timor, spes, et dilectio. COMMUNIONEM, non tantum *externam* in Verbi, Sacramentorum, rituam, professionis, et conversionis societate positam, sed vel maxime *internam* fidei et dilectionis, de quo copulandis pluribus Ecclesiae membris inter se, vinculo, Paulus loquitur." In Spener's *Tabulae Catecheticae*, under *Tabula* XXXV, we have ECCLESIAE NOTAE, DURATIO ET COMMUNIO SANCTORUM. He says: "*Communio Sanctorum.* The saints are all true members of the Church, sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Among these there is communion, not only of temporal, but of spiritual blessings. They have the same head, benefits, means; Eph. 4 : 3, 4, 5, 6; John 17 : 17, 20; 1 John 1 : 3. Hence whatever is given to any of the brethren is given also for my good; whatever is promised to any one, is promised also to me. The prayers of all are poured out also for me. These are grounds of comfort. In turn this communio binds us to believe that all things good or evil are common, to share with others, to assist, to love others, to pray for others. 1. Cor. 12 : 18; Rom. 12 : 4. 5, 6; Eph, 4 : 15, 16; 6 : 18. *Wir stahen alle in gemeinen Gütern.*"

Chemnitz, *Examen*, Ed. Preuss, p. 811, says: "All believers in common have communion or participation of those blessings which are contained in the following articles of the Remission of Sins, and Eternal Life, * * There is a communion of all the saints, all of whom in common, in like manner, and equally, by the grace of God, on account of the merit of Christ, by faith, receive remission of sins and eternal life." Gerhard, *De Eccle.*, Cap. III: "When the Church is called the Communion of Saints, it must be understood not only of the true and living members of the Church militant in this life, but also of the Church triumphant in heaven, for together they constitute one Church."

---

the equivalent of *vere credentium* or *vere fidelium.* Boerner says: "By that name are designated those who truly believe in Christ." *Institutiones Theol. Symb.*, p. 671.

Accordingly Gerhard denominates *Sanctos* not only those who with true faith still contend in this life against the devil, but also and more especially those who have gloriously triumphed in heaven. *Ut Supra.* We therefore accept it as scripturally, confessionally, historically and didactically correct, to call the Church a CONGREGATION OF SAINTS, when reference is had *strictly* and *solely* to the *invisible* body of the Lord Jesus Christ, composed of all those of every name and in every place, who with true faith strive against sin, together with all those who, triumphing over sin and death, have entered the heavenly rest. These are one assemblage,—"no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens of the saints"—between whom there is a true communion, both external and internal as it pertains to those on earth, and truly spiritual as between the saints below and the saints above. And it is to express this thought and to emphasize this momentum of the Church's faith, viz., a common participation* by all the members of the *coetus invisibilis* in the blessings of redemption,—Forgiveness of sins; Resurrection of the body; Life everlasting,—that *Communio Sanctorum* must be reserved, as expressing an essential idea contained in *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, but by no means as identical with it, or equivalent to it. And by "essential idea" in this connection, is meant that in this Holy Catholic Church there are true saints (*sancti*) who have a common inheritance—"*Wir stehen alle in gemeinen Gütern.*" Or that he who would find the Communion of Saints, must seek it in the Holy Catholic Church, as likewise Forgiveness of sins; Resurrection of the body; Life everlast-

---

*The dogmatical and catechetical writers always explain *communio* as an abstract noun, generally equal to *participatio:* "All the saints have communion or participation." Chemnitz, *Examen*, Ed. Preuss, p. 811. "Communion of saints is external and internal. The external consists in the possession of the same faith and the use of the same sacraments. The internal communion is spiritual, consisting in participation, &c."—Gerhard. *De Eccle.*, Cap. III., 16.

"*With whom do saints hold communion or fellowship?*" 1. With the Father, 2. With the Son, 3. With the Holy Ghost, 4. With holy angels, 5. With other saints on earth and in glory."—Church Catechism *ut supra*, p. 105. See Catechisms of Lyser and Spener, also Westcott's *Historic Faith*, p. 241, *et seq.*

ing,*—all of which as corollaries grow out of faith in the Holy Catholic Church, as this itself grows out of *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum*, for he who believes in the Holy Spirit, will believe that He is energetic, and that through the word and the sacraments, He will beget a society in which will be found all the blessings of redemption.

This view of *Communio Sanctorum* has its ground in the Holy Scriptures (see *supra, ad initium*) and has the most indubitable historical support in the Church; and it was especially emphasized by and during the Reformation in opposition to the pure externalism of Rome.

Luther in somewhat happy inconsistency with his own definitions, set the example in his final explanation of *Communio Sanctorum* in the Large Catechism, and is followed by the dogmatical and catechetical writers of the Lutheran Church, though in general with more stress laid on the main idea of common participation.

But Luther errs historically (see *supra, ad initium*) when he says: *Ist nichts anders, denn die Glosse oder Auslegung, da jemand hat wöllen deuten, was die Christliche Kirche heisse.—Rather does it explain what the Christian Church contains.* He also errs philologically when he says that *Communio* ought to be translated *Gemeine*, that is, *congregation*, thus making it equivalent to *ecclesia*, which, he says, properly means nothing else than congregation.

In classic Latin the word *communio* is always used as an abstract noun in our sense of *communion, common participation.* Thus the standard Latin dictionaries. It is never used as the equivalent of *congregatio* or *coetus*, or of any word that means assemblage. Cicero uses it in this way: *Communio legis, C. Juris, sanguinis, literarum et vocum*—where the fundamental and only idea is that of common participation, *communion* from *communis.* The word, though not found in the Vulgate as the rendering of κοινωνία, early entered into the vocabulary of the Church with the meaning as found always in classic Latin.†

*See Chemnitz, *Exam.*, Ed. Preuss, p. 811.

†We mean here the very earliest Christian ages. For later variations see Du Cange *et al. infra.*

Subsequently it also came to mean the *Eucharist*, evidently from St. Paul, 1 Cor. 10 : 16. It thus acquired a technical use and a definite meaning which it has retained to this day. The word passed into the English language as *communion* in the general sense of participation, and with the ecclesiastical meanings found in Walker's Dictionary and Webster's under 3 and 4, and in the Imperial, under 4 and 5. In the sense of "A body of Christians having one common faith and discipline," it is of frequent occurrence among theological writers,* as Lutheran communion, equal to Lutheran Church; Episcopal communion, equal to Episcopal Church; which, so far from being equivalent to *Ecclesia Catholica* in the historical and confessional sense, by the use of such words as "our," "other," "Greek," "Romish," "Protestant," and many others similarly used, actually divides *Ecclesia Catholica* almost without limit. English usage, with which is *arbitrium et jus et norma loquendi*, does not sanction *communion* in the sense of *congregation*, much less in the sense of *Ecclesia Catholica;* nor is it ever so used by English writers, except by those who are determined to make *Communio Sanctorum* the equivalent of *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, which they can render intelligible to English readers only by an explanation. When the word *communio* found its way into the Creed in the eighth century, it was not possible for it to be used in the sense of "A body of Christians having one common faith and discipline," as that definition is now used in English, because then all Christendom was one, and knew itself as *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, which form of expression the Roman Catholic Church never has held and does not now hold, as equivalent to *Communio Sanctorum*—using the word *communio* always in the sense either of *participation*† or *Eucharistia*. Consequently had it been desired at that time, the eighth century, to add a clause

*"Our divines generally as well as in other communions," Jacobs, B. C., Vol. II., p. 14. "Not only of our own communion, but I will venture to say of all Christian communions," Westcott, *Hist. Faith*, p. 120. "The three great communions into which the Christian Church is divided. are those of the Greek, the Romish and the Protestant Churches." Webster.

†The exceptions are technical, but always have the fundamental idea of *participatio*. See Du Cange, *infra*.

to the Creed as purely appositional with, or as purely predicative of the *Holy Catholic Church*, *Communio Sanctorum* could not have been that clause, because the word *communio** did not have the meaning of *Sancta Ecclesia* or of *coetus*, or of *congregatio*, and consequently it could not and would not have been understood in the sense of *congregation*, for, as in the Scriptures, so in the Creed, words were used in the sense sanctioned by the time,—a principle which is as fundamental in the interpretation of the Creed as it is in the interpretation of the Scripture; otherwise we will never know what either means. And as we interpret every other clause of the Creed by the grammatico-historical exegesis, so this also, until it shall have been shown that *communio* had at that time, the eighth century, or whenever it was admitted to the Creed, in current usage, the

---

*So far as I can find, Augustine uses the word only in the sense of common participation: Multi sunt in sacramentorum communione cum ecclesia et tamen jam non sunt in ecclesia. *De Unit. Eccle.* The only use that Quenstedt makes of *Communio Sanctorum* in his Symtema is: Symbolum Apostolicum describit unitatem ecclesiae per κοινωνίαν ἁγίων, sue *Communionem, Sanctorum* qua scil. fideles in Christo cum ipso et inter se communicent. De Ec. Sec. I., xxii.

Du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, Paris, 1840, says: "These words (communio, communicare) are used in different senses by the Fathers and in the councils: Nam *Communicare* dicuntur qui cum aliquo communionem invicem habuit ut Christiani ac fideles. Deinde *Communicare* dicitur qui sacram eucharistiam percepit.

COMMUNIO, Antiphona, a song sung by the choir during the communion.

COMMUNIO which celebrates the slaughter of the Thuringians by the Saxons in 834.

COMMUNIO, Oblatio, largitio.

COMMUNIO, Societas, participatio.

COMMUNIO, Conspiratio. These meanings of *Communio* are amply illustrated in Du Cange, and show that "by the Fathers and in the councils," the word never has the sense of *coetus* or *congregatio* or *ecclesia*.

Forcellini and Faciolati, *Tatius Latinitatis Lexicon*, says: Apud Ecclesiae Scriptores:

*Communio* est consuetudo et conversatio mutua Christianorum inter se.

Item participatio Sacra Eucharistia.

Speciatim *communio laica*.

Communionem mortis scito.

Neither of these greatest standard Latin dictionaries in any way indicates that *communio* was ever used in defining *ecclesia* in whole or in part.

sense of *congregation* or *coetus*. In the Greek text of the Creed we have *κοινωνία ἁγιῶν*. This is a literal translation of *Communio Sanctorum*. In classic Greek the word *κοινωνία** means *fellowship, participation, the having things in common*, from *κοινός, common, shared alike by all.* This meaning of common participation, as an abstract noun, it has always in the New Testament, except, according to Robinson, at Rom. 15 : 26; 2 Cor. 9 : 13, Heb. 13 : 16, where it means "*a contribution*, a collection of money in behalf of poorer churches," the underlying idea still being that of common participation, in that the rich should share their possessions with the poor. Moreover, this word *κοινωνία* is the word used before all others to express the common fellowship which the saints have with each other; and so very generally is the word used in this sense, and so almost exclusively is it appropriated to the inculcation of this doctrine, as to lead to the belief that if the passages in which this word appears, had not been found in the New Testament, the *Communio Sanctorum* had not been found in the Creed, and had never become an article of faith in the Church, inasmuch as so little that is clear and decisive, is elsewhere taught about the communion of saints. Now when the faith of the Church, expressed in *Communio Sanctorum*, was to be placed in the Greek text of the Creed, lo! here were the very words of inspiration ready to receive it—words embalmed in the heart of the Church, and already and for centuries consecrated to the very doctrine in question, *κοινωνία ἁγιῶν*, the former in its etymological signification and in its historical use corresponding exactly to *Communio*, while *ἅγιοι* was the common designation for saints, Christians; that is, the translation put the Church's formulated faith right back into the original words of Holy Writ, which

---

**Κοινωνία*, communio, communitas, consortium, societas. Cicero translates it *communem societatem*. Stephen's *Thesaurus Graecus*. *Κοινωνία*. Communio. Beneficentia. Syn. *Κοινωνημα, ανακοινωσις, κοινοτης, μεταδοσις, μετουσια, μετοχη, μεθεξις, συγκληρωσις*. Morell's Lexicon.

It will thus appear that the highest philological authorities, both Latin and Greek, are decisive against the view of Luther.

had not changed their meaning by their ecclesiastical employment; that is, ἅγιοι still meant *saints*, and κοινωνία still meant *communion*, and not σύνοδος, συναγογὴ, πανήγυρις, which Suidas and Hysechius give as the synonyms of ἐκκλησία.

These facts, then, the fundamental and etymological meaning of the words *communio* and κοινωνία, and their well-known historical usage, put it beyond question that neither of them could have been regarded as fairly synonymous with *ecclesia* or *coetus*, with σύνοδος or συναγωγὴ or πανήγυρις, and consequently that *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica* and *Communio Sanctorum* do not express one and the same idea, and that the latter is epexegetical of the former only in so far as it expresses the one fundamental idea that the Communion of Saints is found only in the Holy Catholic Church, which same affirmation can also be made of the remaining clauses in the Third Article.

This being the conclusion, then, that Communion of Saints is not merely a gloss or explanation of Holy Catholic Church, there can be no question as to the punctuation: If the other clauses of the Third Article be separated by commas, semicolons, colons, periods, so these two. In Müller's Symbolische Bücher, p. 29, all the clauses of this Article, both German and Latin, are separated by periods. At p. 358, all are alike separated by commas. In the B. C. published at Leipzig, 1677, p. 1, all the clauses of this article are separated by colons. In Hase's *Libri Symbolici*, p. 1, they are all separated by commas. In B. C., Leipzig, 1790, only commas are used. In Agende of Pennsylvania Synod, 1786, only commas. In Henkel's Catechism, 1811, periods only. In Melanchthon's *Corpus Doctrinae*, edited by himself in 1560, the very year of his death, we have colons only, in the third article. To the above list reaching back to the period of the Reformation may be added the following catechisms which punctuate all the clauses of the article co-ordinately: Weyl, Balto., 1860; Caspari, Milwaukee; Mann and Krotel, 1864; Missouri Synod's Agende; Wetzel (Woodstock) 1872; also Schaff, (Creeds of Chris.), Latin, Greek and English. Of the many editions of the Catechism and Symbolical Books which we have examined, only the following make a distinction in the punctuation of the clauses of the third article: Dieter-

ich's Catechism, Berlin, 1864, separates the clauses in question by a comma but places a period between the others; the same, (English) Columbus, 1872, uses a comma between Holy Catholic Church and Communion of Saints, but semicolons with the other clauses, as does also the Book of Concord (Jacobs) 1882.

We have not had the means of carrying our examinations further; but from the above exhibit it can easily be seen that the authority for co-ordinate punctuation is well-nigh overwhelming. And yet it must be conceded that co-ordinate punctuation is not decisive of the views of an editor as to the relation of Holy Catholic Church to Communion of Saints, since it may be shown that some expounders of the Creed who punctuate co-ordinately, regard *Communio Sanctorum* as appositive or epexegetical of *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica.* Yet such authorities as Melanchthon, Rechenberg, Spener, Müller, Hase, the fathers of the Pennsylvania Synod, the Missouri theologians *et al.*, ought to be guides for us; and if the argument in the preceding pages shows that *Communio Sanctorum* is not commensurate with *Sancta Ecclesia Catholica*, and that the former was not introduced as "a gloss or explanation by which some one meant to explain what the Christian Church is," then it is evident that co-ordinate punctuation *ought* to prevail throughout the entire third article of the Creed, for all the clauses after the first bear the same relation to *credo*;* that is, they each express a distinct momentum of the Church's faith. And in thus co-ordinating *Communio Sanctorum* with the other clauses of the third article of the Creed, and in making it a separate article of faith, we do not destroy the analogy of the faith, as Gerhard† declares that even they do not destroy the analogy of the faith who separate this article from the preceding and interpret it of the participation in the sacraments; neither do we vacate our right to be called a Lutheran, since it is as clear as day that Chemnitz and Gerhard and others who join it with the preceding article, do *in fact* make it a distinct article of faith, for in the first place they all make it less extensive than Holy Catholic Church, and

*We say *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum;* but *Credo Sanctam Eccl. Cath.*, etc.

†*De Eccl., cap. III.*, 16.

secondly, they all make the chief idea that of common participation in the blessings of redemption. Moreover, when we make it a distinct article of faith we in so far return to the original design of the clause; although we do not thereby obligate ourselves to return absolutely to the originial meaning of the clause, since, as Wilson has said, new opinions have gathered round and appropriated this term; or rather, the term originally having the idea of communion in a very narrow sense, has broadened that idea and embraced in it, especially since the Reformation, a fulness of meaning which corresponds more nearly to the teaching of the Scriptures, that all believers are common participants externally of the word and the sacraments, and internally of faith, love, and the Holy Ghost. Or as Bishop Nicholson has put it: "The meaning of this part of the Creed, is, that the saints have in common one God, one Christ, one Spirit, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one Hope: and they communicate in all duties of charity and piety," Expos. of Cat., p. 63, which agrees in every essential particular with the explanations given above from Chemnitz, Gerhard, Spener and others.

COROLLARIES.

1. If we believe the communion of saints, we believe also that all true believers, all saints in the higher sense, all who have living faith and the Holy Ghost, are, equally with ourselves, fellow-citizens with the saints, partakers of the divine nature, our brethren, entitled to be called and treated as our brethren; and hence we must heartily say with Bishop McIlvaine, "I cannot allow the partition walls, which divide the courts of the Lord's visible house, to prevent me from the precious enjoyment resulting from the thought that wherever my Lord has a true believer, I have a brother."*

2. It is historically justifiable by the example of our forefathers, to expand an article of faith, and to attach to it opinions which it did not originally bear, for it is certain that since the days of the Reformation Protestant theologians have expanded

*See "Luther and the Swiss" (*ad Finem*) by Uhlhorn. Translated by Krotel.

*communio Sanctorum*, and have attached notions to it which it was not originally intended to express, and in doing so they are not supposed to have denied the faith, nor to have cut themselves off from the COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

## ARTICLE VIII.

### NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

PHILLIPS & HUNT, NEW YORK.

For Sale by the J. B. Lippincott Co., Phila.

*The Logic of Introspection;* or Method in Mental Science. By Rev. J. B. Wentworth, D. D. pp. 446.

The theme of this book is *Psychologic Method*, and it is intended as a criticism of the application of the Baconian inductive method in the study of psychology. In the introductory chapter the author sets forth the importance of a correct method, and seeks to determine the only true way of discovering it. The body of the work is divided into four Books, the first reviewing the Status of Psychological Method; the second, the Inductive Method, with its proper Domain and Limitation; the third, the True Psychologic Method; and fourth, Inferences and Conclusions. There are many things in the work which will interest students of mental science, and many sharp and just criticisms of the statements of various psychologists. Dr. Wentworth, however, it seems to us, is wrong in conceiving of the Inductive Method, professedly accepted by various psychologists, in the specific and restricted sense in which that philosopher formulated it in connection with physical investigation. The scope of the method has been enlarged in common employment and used to express the general plan of reaching true conclusions on the basis of exact observation of all the phenomena of either mind or matter—whether the observations be made by the sense-perceptions or by the intuitive consciousness. In neither case—in the study of nature nor of mind—does the process stop with simple observation, but the Reason, with its intuitional perceptions and necessary judgments, discerns the deeper realities in the facts. Certainly, the Baconian method, in the restricted form in which it was originally defined for physical investigation, would alone be a very inadequate instrument for constructing a full psychology, but it seems to us that Dr. Wentworth is arbitrary, and entirely too sweeping, in denying the legitimacy, in mental study, of the method in its enlarged and more general sense.

While it is doubtful whether those who have avowedly used the Inductive Method in psychology, are deserving of the thorough condem-

nation which Dr. Wentworth accords to them, he has called attention to many passages in which its use has not been happy. He writes with ability. The work throughout shows wide reading, independent thinking, and a careful elaboration of the materials used. Its chief value consists in the stress the author lays upon the reality and reliability of the intuitional action of the Reason in the investigation of psychological truth. M. V.

*Commentary on the Old Testament.* Vol. VII.—Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah. Book of Isaiah, by H. Bannister, D. D. Books of Jeremiah and of the Lamentations, by F. D. Hemenway, D. D. D. D. Whedon, LL. D., Editor. pp. 472. 1886.

If they only knew it, the majority of preachers and Bible students can derive a great deal more profit from the use of such a commentary than from the extremely learned and critical works which owe their wide circulation to the distinction of the author's name and the business enterprise of publishers. For all practical purposes Whedon's Commentary is sufficiently learned, while the reader, on the other hand, will not be diverted by it from the study of God's word to the laborious study of a commentary. The theories and objections of skeptical criticism are not ignored, but the authors do not consider the discussion of these to be the main duty of an expositor. The Later Prophecies of Isaiah are ascribed by Dr. Bannister to Isaiah himself with the admission that much honest criticism assumes another hypothesis solely on critical grounds. We note with a keen sense of the Church's loss the death both of Dr. Whedon the editor and of both the authors of this volume prior to its issue from the press. But the work will go on and two more volumes—the Pentateuch, and Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Minor Prophets are well advanced.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

*Geological Studies;* or Elements of Geology. For High Schools, Colleges, Normal and other Schools. Part I. Geology Inductively Presented. Part II. Geology Treated Systematically. With 367 illustrations in the Text. By Alexander Winchell, LL. D., Professor of Geology and Palæontology in the University of Michigan, Formerly Director of the Geological Survey of Michigan, Author of "Geological Excursions," for Elementary Schools, also of "Sketches of Creation," "World-Life," etc., etc. pp. 513. 1886.

Prof. Winchell's rare ability as a geologist and large experience as a practical educator, have given him unsurpassed qualifications for the production of a text-book on this interesting science. An examination of the work before us justifies the favorable expectation raised by the author's eminence in this department of study.

This text-book is constructed upon a unique method, adapting the

progress of investigation to what is usually known as the 'natural order,' beginning with observation and study of the plainest and simplest facts, and then proceeding to a classified and systematic view of the phenomena. The order assumes that the Professor and his class shall commence in the most natural way, going forth, with hammers and other necessary instruments, into the fields or woods, and examining the facts concerned as they are presented to the eye. This will prepare the student to understand and appreciate the subject-matter of the subsequent descriptions and scientific explanations. Hence Part I. of the work treats of Geology as presented "inductively," and furnishes the learner with a mass of materials, as facts and doctrines, the substantial foundations of a geological education. Part II., treating geology systematically, reduces the collected body of facts and principles to methodical re-presentation and scientific order and coherence. Here the discussions of the several topics, touched on in the first part, are completed, and the various portions are adjusted to a logical relation.

This is undoubtedly the true method in pursuing geological studies; and it seems to us that Prof. Winchell has most admirably constructed his text-book for carrying the method into effect. The materials are mostly from American geology, the discussion is fresh and original, and the facts and principles, throughout, are illustrated by apt and fine illustrations. Tables, maps, and other aids to both teacher and student are supplied to an unusual extent.

In a text-book, especially in such a science as geology, much of the comfort of students as well as teachers depends on the publisher. In this case, the publishers, according to their well-known enterprise and taste, have given the whole work, in paper, printing, illustrations, and general mechanical execution, a perfection difficult to surpass. Altogether, the method and attractiveness of the volume, compared with the text-books which some of us had to use in our student days, almost begets the wish that we had the course to go over again.

Prof. Winchell is known as a thorough adherent and advocate of the theory of evolution. Of course this theory is assumed and set forth in this work. It comes up naturally in tracing the progress of terrestrial life. We would prefer a less positive assertion of this hypothesis. The facts in the case, even as detailed by the author, do not seem to us to establish it, and it would be better if Dr. Winchell had maintained more reserve in this connection. We greatly prefer the position of Prof. Dawson on this point. But the general merits of the work are of such high order that its teaching on this point may be passed by with the simple expression of dissent. M. V.

H. B. GARNER, PHILADELPHIA.

For Sale by Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia.

*Biblical Theology of the Old Testament.* Based on Oehler. By Revere Franklin Weidner, Prof. of Theology. Rock Island, Ill. pp. 224. 1886.

This is Part II. of Prof. Weidner's work on *Theological Encyclopædia* and *Methodology* and is sure, like Part I., *Exegetical Theology*, to command a very favorable reception. The volume opens with a very brief *resumé* of Sacred History followed by a discriminating list of standard works in this department. All the remainder of the volume is devoted to the Theology of the Old Testament, on the basis of Oehler's great and masterly work. Scholars have learned to appreciate the distinguished German who in this particular sphere had no superior in his day, but the complete volume is not well adapted as a text-book. Professor Weidner is a practical man and it is evidently his primary aim to meet the needs of American students. A German author is very much like a vine, the more he is pruned, the more fruitful will he be found to Americans, whose preparatory training does not as a rule qualify them to master a production of German Science. The abridgement is, therefore, sure to replace the unabridged work in the class-room. Sometimes, of course, the editor has omitted too much of what seems to us important, as for instance in the use and meaning of the shed blood and in the second principal view of the Malakh Jehovah, but it would be difficult for two minds to agree on the amount of condensation admissible. It must not be supposed either that the present work is merely an abridgment. Prof. W. has also contributed some additions. That "Oehler represents the most conservative tendency of the Luheran Theology of Germany" is a statement that requires modification. His relation to the first edition of *Herzog* is alone an indication of the altitude of his Lutheranism.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

*Scriptures Hebrew and Christian*, Arranged and Edited for Young Readers as an Introduction to the Study of the Bible. By Edward T. Bartlett, A. M., Dean of the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School in Philadelphia and John P. Peters, Ph. D., Professor of the Old Testament Languages and Literature in the same Institution. Vol. I. *Hebrew Story* from Creation to the Exile. Comprising material from the following Books of the Old Testament: Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, I. and II. Samuel, I. and II. Kings, I. and II. Chronicles, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah. pp. 545. 1886.

The somewhat extended title indicates pretty clearly the character and aim of this work. It is a kind of condensation and in part rearrangement of the Bible, preserving for the most part the language of

either the Authorized Version or the recent Canterbury Revision, though sometimes deviating from both in the interest of simplification, and adding occasional glosses. Practical rather than critical considerations have determined the selection and arrangements of passages, yet the best results of critical scholarship have evidently been utilized both in the determination of the original text and its interpretation.

At the head of each chapter have been placed, for purposes of reference, the Bible Chapters from which that chapter has been composed, and then neither the reader nor the sense is confused by the common breaking up of a chapter into small verses. A portion of the Psalms, of Proverbs and of the principal Prophecies are incorporated with the historical parts to which they are supposed to belong chronologically and by which they are often illustrated and interpreted. The rendering of the poetical parts receives careful attention with a view to approximate their original form as well as to bring out more fully their sentiment.

Vol. II. will deal with Jewish history from the Captivity to the time of Christ, Hebrew Laws and Customs, and Hebrew Literature. Vol. III. will contain selections from the New Testament. The general plan of the work must be commended as most excellent by all who are familiar with the study of the Scriptures. It will be a valuable guide to many of the older as well as the younger readers of the Bible for whom it was specially edited, and will give them a fuller knowledge of biblical history than can ordinarily be obtained from reading the entire Scriptures as we have them. The volume gives evidence of much care and labor, of good judgment and mature scholarship. The editors have done their work well and the publishers have gotten it out in capital form.

*The Story of Germany.* By Sabine Baring-Gould, M. A., author of "Germany, Present and Past," etc., with the collaboration of Arthur Gilman, M. A., author of "The Story of Rome," "A History of the American People," etc. pp. 437. 1886.

This is another volume of the series, entitled "The Story of the Nations," now being published by this house. It is admirably adapted for young readers in the style and language used, it being remarkably racy and simple. In a bare outline, such as this must necessarily be in covering over two thousand years, the most salient points are the only ones that can be given, and these are presented quite well. We were entertained, however, on page 187, by the attempt to show the difference in views between the Romish Church and Luther. We quote it:

"Hitherto, the Catholic Church had taught that no man could be *certain* of pardon for his sins, of being justified before God, and of eternal salvation. Everything was conditional. A man was pardoned

his sins *if* he was truly sorry, *if* he confessed them, and *if* he did his utmost to make amends for the wrong done. Justification was the becoming perfectly good and pleasing to God, and man was to aim at this all through life, with hard struggle, helped by divine grace, and the sacraments were the means whereby divine help was given him to push on to perfection. So this, also, was conditional. Lastly, salvation was certain to none without final perseverance. Now, Martin Luther was a very eager, anxious-minded man, and he could not be happy unless he were quite certain of pardon, justification, and salvation. He suffered great distress of mind, through fear of falling short and losing heaven, knowing himself to be a man of violent passions. All at once a new idea struck him, which made all easy and secure. If a man *felt* that he was pardoned, justified, and saved, then the certainty was his. To this feeling of assurance that all was right he gave the name of faith, and called the change from a state of uncertainty to one of confidence,—justification by faith. No more conditions were required, no more chance of fall remained. This doctrine made immense way; it was seized with eagerness."

The illustrations show very well the progress in the art of engraving as well as what was intended by them. The last are the pictures of Bismarck, Emperor William, and the prince imperial, Frederick William. The book is attractive in type and general finish.

PORTER & COATES, PHILADELPHIA.

*The Battle of Gettysburg:* From "The History of the Civil War in America." By the Comte de Paris. Published by special arrangement with the author. pp. 315.

The battle of Gettysburg is regarded not only the greatest ever fought on American soil but one of the greatest in the world's whole history. It has already been the subject of many volumes, and promises to be that of many more. Those that have appeared, while they seem to agree in the main features, differ widely in details, and have given rise to many controversies in pamphlets and the periodical prints. The one that goes most into detail, and which is, at the same time, the most unbiased is that of the Comte de Paris, found in the third volume of his "History of the Civil War in America," and now issued as a separate volume under the editorship of Col. J. P. Nicholson, of Philadelphia. As a foreigner, the author could follow the different armies and observe their movements with a cooler head and more impartiality than an American, whose heart would be with one side or the other. He observed and studied with all the fidelity of a true historian, and, with access to official and reliable un-official documents, he has given an account of this great battle which is *facile princeps*, for accuracy and fullness, among all that have appeared.

IVISON, BLAKEMAN, TAYLOR & CO., NEW YORK AND CHICAGO.

*Outlines of Universal History.* Designed as a Text-Book and for private reading. By George Park Fisher, D. D., LL. D., Professor in Yale College. pp. 674.

Dr. Fisher's attainments in history and his merits as an author are such that a new book of this character from his pen may in advance be accepted as comprehensive, philosophical, impartial, masterful and readable. The closest examination of this volume will confirm this *a priori* estimate. It was a great undertaking to reduce to the compass of a single convenient volume the enormous material collected from the earliest dawn of authentic history to the last quarter of the nineteenth century, but Dr. Fisher was equal to the task and he has given us in this compact form the essential facts of history in all countries and all ages of the world—a vast array of information presented in methodical arrangement, in just proportions and in a lucid and graphic style. The private reader can not complain of dry-as-dust pages. The teacher of history will find it unequaled as a text-book and the general student will keep it on his revolving book-case as an indispensable book of reference. Among the features that will be most prized are the numerous maps which illustrate the successive stages of Empire. The bibliography supplied at the end of each section furnishes the best accessible guides for the farther study of any particular period or subject. No work has appeared for a long time from the American press that has received such unqualified and universal praise as these "Outlines of Universal History."

FUNK & WAGNALLS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

*The Simplicity that is in Christ.* Sermons to the Woodland Church, Philadelphia. By Leonard Woolsey Bacon. pp. 339. 1886.

For entertaining, instructive, searching and stimulating presentations of the gospel we do not know a cleverer example than the polished author of these sermons. And if he would confine himself to 'the simplicity that is in Christ' the American pulpit would have scarcely a brighter light. But Dr. Bacon has a constitutional fondness for that which is just the reverse of simplicity. He loves to entangle men in doctrinal confusion. Even these sermons reveal a disposition not to clear up hazy truths but to magnify what is defective in their statement and to distort accepted definitions. Whatever lofty aim may actuate these vigorous and sprightly discussions, they are so over-seasoned with cavil and caricature as to cause more provocation than profit. Take as an instance the sermon on the "Simplicity of Faith," which the author admits to be somewhat of a theological treatise. He sets up a number of "mistaken definitions of faith" which in his extensive studies he has found among Calvinistic authors, and claims that it is a question to this day among theologians what that thing is to which the promise of eter-

nal salvation is given? He affects keen regret that there is no controversy rife on this subject, and charges that the most generally current definition of faith is the assent of the intellect to truth.

The critic cannot believe that Dr. Bacon is groping here in ignorance. He is too brilliant a scholar not to know the distinctions of *Credere Deum, Credere Deo, and Credere in Deum*, which are as old as Augustine, which even scholastic theology took pains to maintain, and a Scriptural basis for which is given unmistakably in Jno. 14 : 10–12. Dr. Bacon well knows that all Protestant Churches and theologians hold that there are diversities of faith, and if representative Presbyterian divines do actually teach that faith "is nothing more than the intellectual act of believing"—"a simple credence of the truths of revelation," and that this saves the sinner, then it can be easily shown that notwithstanding their great renown and representative position these teachers subverted the doctrines of the Church Catholic. It might be well for this assailant of Calvinism to study on this point the great Lutheran dogmaticians who in the seventeenth century gave careful and precise definitions to Reformation theology. That Dr. B. did not wholly despair of stirring up a quarrel by the publication of these sermons may be gathered from an extract of the preface: "Something seemed to be due to those persons who have manifested an eager desire to find something to complain of in my preaching, but have had little or no opportunity of having it. I am afraid that they will be disappointed in the book; but they may be assured that they were considered in the selection of sermons for it, with an honest purpose of giving them such as they would most enjoy being displeased with."

*English Hymns:* Their Authors and History. By Samuel Willoughby Duffield, Author of "The Latin Hymn Writers and their Hymns," "The Heavenly Land," etc., etc. pp. 675. 1886.

Thousands use the Psalms and other parts of sacred Scripture in their devotions without any knowledge of the occasion or circumstances to which they owe their origin, yet what an addition of interest and often of edification the history of these inspired lyrics is apt to awaken. In like manner the peculiar incidents, personal experiences, and notable or historical associations connected with many of our popular hymns render them even more precious and more powerful Eliminate the storms of the Reformation and the heroic struggles of Luther from the Battle-Hymn "Ein feste Burg" and you destroy a large measure of its force and meaning. Perhaps its greatest merit lies in the truth that it is "the Reformation in Song." How it helps to stir one's soul when in singing "Fear not, O little flock, the foe" we remember that it was the battle-song of Gustavus Adolphus' army, primarily his own composition, and that after the king had knelt in their presence and invoked the aid of heaven, the army was accustomed to burst out in these inspiring

strains of praise and trust. A chapter from real life is thus associated with many of the songs of Zion and some of them offer enough of such material to fill a volume. Much of this belongs of course to the department of legend, but Dr. Duffield has obviously taken pains to sift out the truth and he parts with the most beautiful traditions when they prove to have no basis of fact. What a delightful exercise it is likewise to trace a noble hymn through several translations to its supposed original far down the ages. Believers who now sing "O Sacred head, now wounded," cannot be separated by a wide chasm from the Lutherans who more than two centuries ago contemplated their dying Saviour in the strains of Gerhardt's "O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden" and these in their turn must have been one in faith with the saints of the twelfth century for whom Bernard of Clairvaulx composed "*Salve Caput Cruentatum.*" Good judgment, sound taste, and a reverent care for spiritual interests mark the volume and it is to be welcomed as a handbook of solid and enduring value by all who love "the good old hymns." How the joys of our life are multiplied by the writers who keep in mind the law of the association of ideas and who base their literary labors on that universal law.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

*The Six Days of Creation.* The Fall and The Deluge. By. J. B. Reimensnyder, D. D., author of "Heavenward," "Doom Eternal." "Spiritualism," etc. pp. 368.

Dr. Reimensnyder has given us a very readable volume on a theme of transcendent interest, and the publisher has made it very attractive to the eye. The chaste style of the author marks every page and passages of genuine eloquence abound. But best of all the work is conceived and executed with a view to edification, and while dealing with questions that have puzzled the profoundest philosophers, it treats them in such a way that spiritual and practical reflections press upon the reader continually and the untutored layman as well as the scholar may study every chapter with pleasure and profit.

On the skeptical questions raised in connection with the historic events discussed, Dr. Reimensnyder is eminently conservative. His readers will be in no danger of having their simple minds corrupted by the novelties of science falsely so-called. The old theories about the six natural days, the origin of man, the extent of the flood, not to mention the position of woman, are here maintained without wavering or qualification. And this not because of the author's ignorance of modern scientific teachings, but because he regards the old theories as better than the new. He might indeed have dwelt more on the fact that some of the ablest biblical scholars accept the conclusions of scientists on these points as fully harmonizing with Moses. It is, however, a happy relief not to be kept toiling all the time in the meshes of theories and

hypotheses which blind the eye to the underlying spiritual truths that form the essential contents of Sacred Writ. The chapter on "The Sabbath of Creation—Institution and Obligation" is especially deserving of attention and admiration.

*The Stork Family in the Lutheran Church:* or Biographical sketches of Rev. Charles Augustus Gottlieb Stork, Rev. Theophilus Stork, D. D., and Rev. Charles A. Stork, D. D. By John G. Morris, D. D., LL. D., author of "Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry," "Journeys of Luther," "Luther at Coburg," etc., etc. pp. 263. 1886.

This is the first of a series of biographical sketches of deceased Lutheran ministers which, we are gratified to learn, the Lutheran Board of Publication has decided to issue. It is a worthy forerunner in subjects and interest, and we trust that those which are to follow will fully equal it. It is the story of grandfather, father and son—three men whose lives cover the period of the growth of the Lutheran Church from its small beginnings to what it now is, the third in numerical strength of the Protestant denominations in the United States.

The sketch of the grandfather is short, owing to the scarcity of data readily accessible. It is, however, intensely interesting, and the reader will regret there is not more of it. For the other two the author had ample material, but was under orders to keep within a limited space, and hence had to omit much of what he had gathered. The letters give evidence of glowing earnestness and piety. Nowhere can we find men more sincere and more consecrated to their calling as ministers of the Gospel than the three Storks. They were Israelites in whom there was no guile, and preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ was their delight. We here recall part of a conversation with the youngest, five or six months after entering upon his duties in the Theological Seminary. He rather abruptly asked: "B——, do you like teaching young men?" To my affirmative reply he said: "There isn't half the satisfaction to me that there was in preaching regularly." And yet what a teacher he was! Ask the young men who were under him. But as a preacher he specially excelled.

All three had their periods of despondency—perhaps a case of hereditary transmission, or possibly due to lack of vigorous health. There is a vein of sadness running through each of the three lives, due possibly to frequency of depression, and yet a strength of faith that is positively exhilarating to a Christian. As preachers and humble believers they were men whose biographies will not fail to prove helpful to others.

Our notice would not be complete without referring to the letters of Mrs. Emma B. Stork, wife of Dr. Theophilus, which occupy so large a space and show not only a pure, Christian spirit, but also a high degree of literary culture.

*Biography of Alfred J. Fox, M. D.*, Evangelical Lutheran Minister of the Tennessee Synod, and Physician. By his son, Rev. Junius B. Fox, A. M., with an introduction by his son, Prof. Luther A. Fox, D. D. pp. 150. 1885.

A modest volume, but one that serves as a genuine enrichment of our biographical literature. Dr. Fox was a conspicuous and honored figure in the peculiar history of the Lutheran Church in the South, having been one of the leaders of the Tennessee Synod not only in its contests with other Lutherans, but also in the transformations that took place within that remarkable body which for twenty years was composed of self-educated men, not one of whom had ever been graduated from either a college or a theological seminary. To Dr. Fox more perhaps than to any one else was due the inauguration of Missions, Education and Sunday-schools which stamped the imprint of the Gospel and the spirit of the age upon this ancient body of strict Lutherans. We have read with much interest the lively delineation of his character by his younger son, and especially the sententious introduction by the elder, both of them polished scholars, as also the able memorial discourse by the Rev. A. J. Brown, D. D., and the two sermons by the subject of this sketch which are appended. We sincerely hope that the little volume may have a wide circulation.

R. M. STURGEON & CO., HARRISBURG, PA.

*A Complete Handbook of the Monuments and Indications* and a Guide to the Positions on the *Gettysburg Battle-field.* By J. Howard Wert, A. M., Principal of the Boys' High School, Harrisburg, Pa., and late Lieutenant Pennsylvania Volunteers. pp. 212. 1886.

There has probably never been published a work more sure to command the national market than this excellent Handbook of the Gettysburg Battle-field by Prof. Wert. With the extraordinary interest which the whole country feels in this memorable contest, and the scores and scores of noble monuments and tablets which now cover these hills of blood, the great and ever-increasing body of visitors will want just such a guide as they wander over the immense area on which the battle raged, and those who cannot come to the sacred spot will even more eagerly desire a work which thoroughly describes the successive stages and different parts of the battle, which outlines very clearly the positions of the contending hosts andwhich presents in striking illustrations the numerous monuments which have been erected. Prof. Wert wields a strong and graceful pen and having spent a large part of his life in this immediate community he enjoyed peculiar facilities for getting up an accurate and most interesting book.

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON. CHAS. T. DILLINGHAM, NEW YORK.

*A Handbook of English History* Based on the Lectures of the late M. J. Guest and brought down to the year 1880 with a supplementary

chapter upon English Literature of the Nineteenth Century. By Francis H. Underwood, A. M., author of Handbooks of "English Literature," etc., with Maps, Tables, etc. pp. 614. 1886.

A competent authority has pronounced Guest's "Lectures of English History" as being for their compass the most interesting, impartial, complete and satisfactory ever published. The author had wide knowledge of his subject gained from original sources and he aimed at conducting his readers back to these original fountains there to revel for themselves in the old literature of their country, breathe the same air, think the same thoughts and feel the same feelings as their fathers had done.

A reverent tone pervades the volume and though its candor is conspicuous the cause of Protestantism is delineated in strong colors.

The work of Mr. Underwood has been to adapt the excellent material of Mr. Guest to American students. Having been written by an Englishman for use in an English college, the whole point of view had to be changed. While preserving the author's admirable methods and views the editor has transformed the original book into a volume which in attractive features and solid merits surpasses every compendium of English history known to the writer. For acceptable handbooks the enterprise of Lee and Shepard has not been excelled.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

*Modern Unitarianism*, Essays and Sermons. By Rev. James Freeman Clarke, D. D., Rev. Joseph Henry Allen, Rev. Samuel R. Calthrop, Rev. Brooke Herford, Rev. John White Chadwick, Rev. Minot J. Savage, Rev. Edward Everett Hale, D. D., Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, Rev. Howard N. Brown, Rev. Andrew P. Peabody, D. D., Rev. Robert Collyer, Rev. Joseph May.

These authors could not make a dull book but they have made a dreary one. With all their grace, beauty, refined sentiment and elevated tone, one wearies of the constant misapprehensions and distortions of the faith and the struggling and futile endeavors to set forth another gospel, or at least to substitute a very small fragment of the Gospel for the whole of it. What a melancholy impression, too, of failure, is made upon the reader, as he contemplates a movement which one hundred years ago started with "a large proportion of the ablest clergy and most influential congregations" of New England, which in the most advanced portion of that latitude "was almost completely identified with the best intelligence, the highest social rank and culture, the morality and humanity, the arts, learning and letters, the political eloquence, the professional and public life of the community" and notwithstanding all this can sum up to-day but three hundred and sixty churches—many of them quite feeble—"and full one-third of these

originally local parishes, founded under the first ecclesiastical polity of the Puritan Colonists."

A Lutheran theologian of Germany remarked of the origanization of the Old Catholics that no religious reform could be successful which did not begin with the question, what must I do to be saved? With that began Luther's movement and afterwards Wesley's and they triumphed. But that vital and momentous question has no place either at the foundation or at any other stage of the Unitarian system.

If intelligent, great and noble men could insure the prosperity of ɛ new religious departure, the Unitarians would have swept the country, but in this domain it is not by might nor by power but by the action of the Spirit that success is achieved and the Spirit appropriates to believers the things of Jesus. Those who will not follow in the line of the Spirit, are therefore left to their own darkness and feebleness. And though they talk of knowledge, as does the Rev. May, and "accept of the leadership of Jesus because we feel that in this he had the truth," yet now, as of old, knowledge only puffeth up and here is a volume of learned sermons with hardly a single allusion to faith, forgiveness, prayer or salvation?

As a useful contribution to Church history the little work commends itself, while Dr. Peabody's discourse on the "Simplicity of the Gospel" and Robert Collyer's on "Visions and Patterns" will richly repay every intelligent reader.

D. APPLETON & CO., NEW YORK.

*A History of Education* by F. V. N. Painter, A. M., Professor of Modern Languages and Literature in Roanoke College. pp. 335. 1886.

Under the title of *International Education Series* and the general editorship of William T. Harris, LL. D., the eminent publishers propose to bring out a series of volumes that will form a much needed library for teachers and school managers and also furnish text-books for Normal Classes. The entire field of practical, theoretical and historical education is to be covered by the series. The conspectus embraces I. History of Education, II. Educational Criticism, III. Treatises on the Theory of Education, IV. The Art of Education.

Fifteen volumes are well under way, European as well as American authors contributing to the series. Dr. Harris is expected to write some of the volumes himself while he will add to each separate one something by way of introduction, analysis and commentary. The first two volumes have appeared, *The Philosophy of Education* by Johann Karl Frederick Rosenkranz, and the bright little volume before us by the youthful Roanoke professor who is not a stranger to the readers of the QUARTERLY.

Of the History of Education, a subject that has been too much neglected in Americaf he has made an entertaining and instructive and use-

ful treatise, which will be gratefully hailed by all who are interested in the progress of education. He takes a full and clear though necessarily brief survey of the subject under the following heads: The Oriental Nations, The Ancient Classical Nations, Christian Education before the Reformation, Education from the Reformation to the Present. He has had access to the best authorities in German and French and has made a faithful and discriminating use of them. He is evidently in love with his theme and keeps a happy balance between adherence to past acquisitions and enthusiasm for modern views. Famous educators from Confucius and Socrates to Pestalozzi and Froebel pass under review with judicious criticism and commendation, but the reader will recognize as towering above them all the influence of Martin Luther on education. and must conclude that he was the educational as well as the religious reformer of the sixteenth century. We recommend this work to all who are in any way engaged in the diffusion of education and we congratulate the prosperous Institution "in the Virginia Mountains" on the honor which accrues to it from authorship of this quality. We shall look with avidity for the succeeding volumes of the series snd we trust that the success of Prof. Painter's first venture will prompt him to keep his graceful pen in motion.

LUTHERAN CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Eine Union in der Wahrheit.* Zum 350 jährigen Gedächtnisse der Wittenberger Concordie vom Jahre 1536. Der Kirche unserer Zeit als ein Spiegel vorgehalten von G. Gösswein, evangelisch-lutherischer Pastor zu Vincennes, Ind. pp. 186. 1886.

This volume answers well as a vade-mecum for those who seek to familiarize themselves with the unionistic efforts of the earlier days of Protestantism.

With great fairness, and in the exact words of the participants, the various points of disagreement are clearly exhibited, enabling the reader to transfer himself in spirit to those times of newly-aroused earnest search after truth, and witness for himself the laudable zeal of those who were struggling to be of one mind and of one heart in holding and proclaiming it.

The famous colloquy at Marburg is graphically described, with its antecedents and consequences; Luther's unfraternal attitude being vindicated as the only one possible where the end aimed at was "*a union in the truth.*"

With this colloquy is approvingly contrasted *the Wittenburg Concord;* and the conduct of Bucer, Capito and their colleagues is held up as a model worthy of imitation by all in our day who are longing for union in the Church. Their frank disavowal of their previous opinions and practices, and their solemn pledge to teach thenceforth in strict accordance with the views held by the Wittenberg theologians, this is

held by the author to be the only scriptural basis for "a union in the truth."

C. A. H.

*Biblische Geschichten* für Mittelklassen und gemischte Schulen. Mit den Worten der heil. Schrift erzählt. pp. 260. 1886.

Bright and large print on good paper and copious illustrations which strike the eye with sacred scenes, mark this abridged Bible History which is told in the words of the Scriptures and in a style, accordingly, which has never been equaled.

*Tanz und Theaterbesuch.* Je Zwei Vorträge hierüber, Von C. F. W. Walther. pp. 118. 1886.

This is a pocket edition of the excellent sermons on Theater-going by Prof. Dr. Walther, noticed in a previous number of the QUARTERLY.

R. WOBUS, ST. CHARLES, MO.

*Evangelischer Kalender* Auf das Jahr unseres Herrn 1887. Herausgegeben von der Evangelischen Synode von Nord-Amerika.

The first of the yearbooks to reach us is from the Evangelical Synod (The Prussian Union) of North America and it excels in the quality of its contents as well as in the promptness of its appearance. Besides the statistical matter of the body, the clerical register, etc., it contains about 100 pages of short, entertaining and wholesome articles, calculated to make it quite a valuable addition to the literature of the fireside. We know of nothing in this line superior to it in English or German.

SCHAEFFER & KORADI, PHILADELPHIA.

*Die Spinnstube*, ein Volksbuch fuer das Jahr 1887. Begründet von M. O. von Horn (Wilhelm Oertel). Im Vereine mit namhaften Volksschriftstellern fortgeführt von H. Oertel. Zweiundreirzigster Jahrgang. Mit einem Stahlstich und vielen Abbildungen. Wiesbaden.

Among the flood of almanacs with which Germany is deluged near the close of the year, the one here introduced to us seems to have won a wide reputation and made sure for itself a warm welcome in Christian families in this its thirty-second annual issue.

It is a sprightly and entertaining volume of one hundred and sixty-four pages, edited in a genial, evangelical spirit; giving, of course, the usual calendar, with useful hints for work in the house and on the farm, the German weights and measures, postal laws, list of European sovereigns, etc., etc., but furnishing also some pretty stories of a wholesome tendency, interspersed with scraps of poetry, riddles, anecdotes, etc. The artistic character of the profuse illustrations is very creditable.

☞Notices of the following Books will appear hereafter:

*Spinoza and his Environment* a critical essay with the translation of the Ethics by Henry Smith, D. D., LL. D. Robert Clarke & Co., Cincinnati.

*Systematic Theology* a Compendium and Commonplace-book designed for the use of Theological Students by Augustus Hopkins Strong, D. D. E. R. Andrews, Rochester.

*Ancient Cities from the Dawn to the Daylight.* By William Burnet Wright, Pastor of the Berkley Street Church, Boston. 1886. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.